

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1900.

SOME NOTES ON PNIOWER'S *Goethes Faust*.

OTTO PNIOWER'S *Goethes Faust, Zeugnisse und Excurse zu seiner Entstehungsgeschichte*, ranks in importance and usefulness next after the Weimar edition of the drama. It furnishes us with all the evidence upon the genesis of the work and Goethe's occupation with it that could be collected from his diaries, his correspondence, his conversations, his autobiographical writings, the correspondence of his friends, the *Ausleihejournal* of the Weimar library, and other sources. Instead of making an attempt to set forth the many excellencies and few shortcomings of the book, I offer some observations which, though prompted by points in which I felt obliged to disagree with Pniower, yet are not strictly confined to them.

THE INSUFFICIENCY OF THE DIARIES.

Pniower lays special stress upon the insufficiency of the diaries as a foundation of *Faust* chronology. The three instances of insufficiency cited in the preface (p. ix), however, are not happily chosen. The first relates to December 1797, a month for which, he thinks, the letters prove close occupation with *Faust*, while the diary has no entries whatever. A closer examination of the letters reveals, however, that they testify to thoughts and intentions concerning *Faust* rather than to actual work. That in fact no real work was done during that time is proved all but conclusively by a letter from the beginning of the following month; on Jan. 2, 1798, Goethe writes to Knebel: *Ich will nun nach und nach (!) wieder an irgend eine Arbeit gehen . . . Ich denke den Faust zuerst vorzunehmen.*¹ He, therefore, had not been engaged upon *Faust* or any other labor for a considerable length of time.

Pniower's second instance of supposed insufficiency of the diaries is found under June 18, 1830, the date of the scheme of the prologue of the third act. Yet under the same date we

¹ I am fully aware that some work on *Oberons und Titanias goldne Hochzeit* may have been done during that time, but this production had not been conceived as a part of *Faust*, and as late as Dec. 20 Goethe had not definitively decided to incorporate it.

read in the diary: *Fortsetzungen aller Art besorgt*, and hence we ask the question why these may not comprise a continuation of *Faust* as well as other continuations.

The third instance, finally, is that of May 16, 1831, the day when the long scheme of the fourth act was written. Here the diary of that particular day may indeed be silent, but an entry of the next day says: *Poetische Vorarbeiten* and, therefore, is exactly to the point. Whether this conflict of dates is due to an actual mistake on the part of Goethe or John, or whether Goethe did not consider the scheme finished till the seventeenth, the case involves at most an error of twenty-four hours.

While Pniower's warning should be heeded as far as the desultory records of Goethe's daily doings at certain times of the period when he was completing the First Part are concerned, my own experience has convinced me that, however insufficient the extracts from the diaries as published in Erich Schmidt's *Urfaust*² may have proved, the diaries themselves furnish a firm basis for the study of the gradual evolution of the Second Part between 1825 and 1831. Perhaps there may be a few more cases where work done on one day was recorded under the next, or where it may be necessary to decide from the connection as to whether a certain expression points to work on *Faust* or not, but upon the whole it may be safely said that whenever during those years there is no reference to *Faust*, there was no occupation with it worth recording. Just a few lines may now and then have been scribbled or some little *Mundiren* done at odd times without being chronicled.³

THE RESUMPTION OF THE WORK ON FAUST IN THE NINETIES.

It would seem that an unbiased reader of the references to the drama in Goethe's correspondence and diaries of 1797 and 1798 must admit that their whole tenor shows that 1797

² Erich Schmidt, *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt*, 3rd ed. 1894, shows over fifty omissions and a number of other errors within the space of the four years from 1827-1830. Pniower's extracts on the contrary are practically complete. Private advices say that the extracts from the diaries will not be republished in connection with the 4th edition of the *Urfaust*.

³ With regard to dating lines written on playbills or the like, compare *Americana Germanica* iii p. 213 f.

was the time when the work was resumed, and that this resumption took place after a long interruption. Indeed, if all other evidence were lost, the *Zueignung* alone should prove this. Nevertheless Pniower makes a long argument in favor of 1796. In the first place he quotes (p. 43) the statement in the *Annalen* for 1796: *... bei der entschiedenen Lust, das Theater kräftig zu beleben, ward ich angeregt, den Faust wieder hervorzunehmen.* But this is contradicted by a statement in the letter to Schiller of June 22, 1797: *Unser Balladenstudium hat mich wieder auf diesen Dunst- und Nebelweg (that is, Faust) gebracht.* The contemporary evidence naturally deserves more credence than the other, which is from twenty to thirty years later, and admittedly not over-particular in matters of chronology.

In the second place, Pniower (p. 44 ff.) calls attention to the influence which Joh. Friedrich Schink's dramatic sketch *Doktor Faust's Bund mit der Hölle* seems to have exercised upon Goethe, and argues that, since the production of Schink was quite insignificant, Goethe can only have made use of it immediately upon its appearance in the summer of 1796. But is it logical, we may ask, to maintain, on the one hand, that Schink's sketch made such an impression upon Goethe that he began the work on the corresponding parts of his own drama *angeregt durch die Lectüre der Schinkschen Dichtung* (p. 46), and then to presume on the other that it was so insignificant (*unbedeutend*) (p. 50) that he was not at all likely to have given it a second reading at a later time? Can such an argument overrule the contemporary evidence which is all in favor of 1797?⁴

Yet Pniower has still a third and more elaborate chain of reasoning. He asserts (pp. 51 ff.) that Goethe, having begun the composition of *Faust* 'ohne einen das ganze umfassende Plan,' was as late as 1795 prevented from resuming the work because he had not found *das künstlerische Band* and did not know how to fill *die grosse Lücke*. In 1797, however, expressions such as *Die Arbeit passt sich recht gut zu einer verworrenen Stimmung—Das Drama ist eine barbarische Composition*—and a designation of his work as *Possen* prove that he had found

⁴ Pniower (p. 50) also calls attention to Schink's *Prolog zu einem dramatischen Gedicht: Doktor Faust*, which appeared in 1795. Strange to say, Lessing's prologue is not mentioned.

the artistic connection and knew how to fill the gap. As the solution cannot have occurred to him in his restless state of mind in June 1797, it must have come to him some time between 1795 and 1797, that is, in 1796. Now a careful survey of the critical years and the genesis of *Faust* in general, with the aid of the Weimar edition and Pniower's own book, has led me to quite different results. Goethe tells us that he did have a skeleton plan from the very beginning.⁵ At least at the time of the *Fragment* he must have had in mind something in the nature of a contest, or a wager, between Faust and Mephistopheles, because Mephistopheles does not get possession of Faust by virtue of the compact, but is still merely hopeful of catching him after the compact has been made.⁶ Indeed, Luden reports that Goethe told him that the parts of the *Fragment* had been taken out of a whole.⁷ On the other hand, even in 1797, when, according to Pniower, the artistic connection had been found, this very connection was evidently somewhat loose. Goethe speaks of the plan as being *eigentlich nur eine Idee*; he threatens if he had time, *so sollte das Werk zu männiglicher Verwunderung und Entsetzen, wie eine grosse Schwammfamilie, aus der Erde wachsen*; and in contrast to Schiller, who lays so much stress upon the *poetischen Reif* and the philosophical part, he asserts that he is going to take it easier and that the whole will always remain a fragment.⁸ Where is there a trace of a special intuition with regard to the great gap and the artistic connection that had come to Goethe between August 1795 and June 1797, or any indication that 1796 was such an epoch-making year in the genesis of *Faust*?

Very fortunately Goethe himself has told

⁵ Goethe to Zelter, June 1, 1831:

Es ist keine Kleinigkeit, das was man im zwanzigsten Jahre concipirt hat, im zweyundachtzigsten ausser sich darzustellen, und ein solches inneres lebendiges Knochengeripp mit Sehnen Fleisch und Oberhaut zu bekleiden, auch wohl dem fertig hingestellten noch einige Mantelfalten umzuschlagen.

Compare also the famous letter to Humboldt of March 17, 1832:

Es sind über sechzig Jahre, dass die Conception des Faust bei mir jugendlich von vorne herein (in a local sense) klar, die ganze Reihenfolge hin weniger ausführlich vorlag.

Finally *Partipomenon* 63, which, though penned in 1816, surely in the main represents his plan as it existed in 1775.

⁶ *Fragment*, I, 1998 (Seuffert)—*Faust*, I, 3325: *Gelt! dass ich dich fange!* Compare also *Fragm.* II, 339 ff.—*F.* I, 1860 ff.

⁷ Pniower, I, c. p. 95.

⁸ Goethe to Schiller, June 22, July 1; Schiller to Goethe, June 26; Goethe to Schiller, June 27, 1797.

us—the passages are in Pniower's book (pp. 63 and 43)—what in reality did prevent him for so long a time from resuming the work. It was not what Pniower alleges, but the difficulty of melting again the material that had become congealed, of dissolving again the powder that had formed a sediment. Says he in a letter to Schiller's wife, April 21, 1798:

'Was mich so lange Jahre abgehalten hat wieder daran (that is, an *Faust*) zu gehen war die Schwierigkeit den alten geronnenen Stoff wieder ins Schmelzen zu bringen. Ich . . . hoffe nun das Werk gehörig im Fluss zu erhalten—' and almost three years earlier in a letter to Schiller himself, Aug. 17, 1795:

'Mit diesem letzten (that is, *Faust*) geht mir's wie mit einem Pulver, das sich aus seiner Auflösung nun einmal niedergesetzt hat; so lange Sie dran rütteln, scheint es sich wieder zu vereinigen, sobald ich wieder für mich bin, setzt es sich nach und nach zu Boden.'

The expressions, furthermore, in which Pniower sees evidence of obstacles successfully overcome, have a very different meaning. Goethe speaks in them as a Grecian. Just as he designates *Faust* as *Possen* now, he had referred to the *Fragment* as *Tollheiten* eight years before and was to count Part First among *holzschnittartige(n) Spässe* eight years later.⁹ And what else could *Faust* be to a Grecian but a 'barbarous composition?' Only we should be careful to take 'barbarous' here in the Greek sense, not in its modern meaning. The *verworrene Stimmung*, finally, while it clearly unfitted Goethe for the sustained and objective effort which his epic plan required, still allowed him to hope that he might be able to make some headway with a work as subjective as *Faust* and to which he might apply himself at odd hours.¹⁰ As a matter of fact, to be sure, *Faust* also proved too hard a task under the circumstances, and ceased to progress after little more than the *Zueignung* and an *Ausführlicheres Schema* had been completed.¹¹

Between the end of June 1797 and the early part of April 1798 we hear only of interest in the work and intentions and concern about it. Not till May 5, 1798, does Goethe report that he has really carried out the intentions ex-

pressed in the letter of June 22, 1797. Only then the old manuscript has been copied, and the separate parts of it have been arranged in in fascicles according to the numbers *eines ausführlichen Schemas*. Here Pniower fails to realize the identity of this scheme with the one noted in the diary under June 23, 1797. Consequently a reference to May 5, 1798, is wanting in the latter place, and a reference to the imaginary *Schema vom 5. Mai 1798* is made under Aug. 3, 1815. Indeed it almost seems as if he considered the various *Paralipomena* which contain *ad* followed by some number not as classified according to the scheme, but as parts of it, since he says (p. 65): *Mit Sicherheit darf man auch die Paralipomena 93-95 zu dem alten Schema rechnen*. A scheme is of course always in prose.

THE DOG-SHAPE OF MEPHISTOPHELES.

In the course of an interesting discussion of the time when Goethe composed the lines that speak of the trail of fire which follows the poodle, Pniower (pp. 132 ff.) decides in favor of the time of the *Fragment*, and against the Frankfurt period, because he regards the lines of the *Urfaust*, p. 80, ll. 15 ff.:

wandle den Wurm wieder in die Hundsgestalt in der er sich nächtlicher Weile oft gefiel vor mir herzutrotten, dem harmlosen Wanderer vor die Füße zu kollern . . . Wand! ihn wieder in seine Lieblingsbildung

as evidence of a different plan. He, therefore, probably supposes them to imply that before assuming human form Mephistopheles was associated with Faust for a considerable period in the shape of a dog. I will not undertake to point out at any great length that such prolonged mute association between the two principal characters is contrary to the Faust legend and would have proved most unsatisfactory, if not unmanageable, from a dramatic point of view; I will simply state what the real meaning of the lines appears to be.

'Change the worm again into the dog-shape in which he by night (not at other times) often (not always) was pleased (in the past, no longer now) to divert me! Change him again into his favorite shape!' (Cf. also Schröder.)

That is, we are given to understand that Mephistopheles had not lost the faculty of assuming the shape in which he first introduced himself to Faust, and which in that case he had donned

⁹ Letters of Nov. 5, 1789 and Sept. 30, 1805.

¹⁰ Letters of June 29 and June 22, 1797.

¹¹ The Eckermann-Riemer *Faust* chronology assigns the *Prolog im Himm!* to 1797, we do not know upon what authority. If this should be correct, it was perhaps composed during the same few days in June.

at will, but that, as long as Faust had been in a mood to enjoy such diversions, he had often reassumed it on their nightly walks when his services were not otherwise needed, and naturally had been pleased to do so because it was the shape he preferred to any other. Faust had been able to constrain him to assume human form, but he had no power to convert him into a dog again. If the lines had contained evidence of an abandoned plan, nothing would have been easier for Goethe, had he been so minded, than to adjust them to the new circumstances when he revised them for publication between 1798 and 1806. But instead of making a considerable change, as he did in a few other places of the scene, he confined himself to writing *in seine Hundsgestalt, wie er sich oft nächtlicher Weile gefiel* instead of *in die Hundsgestalt in der er sich nächtlicher Weile oft gefiel*. On this trait of the harmlessness of Faust's and Mephistopheles' earlier intercourse, which stands out with such bright effect in the midst of the fearful sombreness of the scene which had defied the poet's efforts to give it metrical form, learned *Faust* criticism, so often bent upon ferretting out incongruities instead of giving explanations that are obvious, has reared a whole edifice of hypotheses concerning an earlier plan, until some who could not imagine that Mephistopheles in his capacity as a spirit might well know all about Faust's intention of taking his own life, without having been present in some corporeal shape, have gone so far as seriously to believe that originally the poodle occupied the place of the Easter bells, an idea which indeed is more worthy of a critic than of a poet. Whoever, on the other hand, can accept the straight and plain interpretation of the lines as given above, is also at liberty to admit that the passage about the trail of fire which follows the poodle may belong to the Frankfurt period, an assumption which, all things considered, appears most likely from the way in which Goethe speaks of that optical illusion in his essay on *Physiologie Farben*.¹²

THE SCHEMES OF THE 'ANTECEDENZIIEN' OF
THE HELENA DRAMA FROM NOV. 9 TO
DEC. 18, 1826.

In Pniower's opinion (pp. 164 ff.) the evolu-

¹² Pniower, l. c., states, p. 134, that the essay seems to have been written in 1820. *Faust* II, 3270 f. refer to I, 1571.

tion and interrelation of the schemes of November and December 1826 is in substance as follows. On Nov. 8, Goethe turned his attention to the old *Paralipomenon* No. 63. On the next two days he continued this *Paralipomenon*, but *nach vorn*. The first part of this continuation, covering Nos. 1-6, was lost. The second has been preserved in the draft of Nov. 9 and *Paralipomenon* No. 99, which belongs to Nov. 10. Between Dec. 15 and 18, Goethe went to work to enlarge this *Paralipomenon* No. 99. The enlarged scheme which in the diary is termed *Antecedenzen zu Faust*, Dec. 15, and *Einleitung zur Helena*, Dec. 16 and 18, is *Paralipomenon* No. 123, although this bears the date of Dec. 17. The *Schema zu den Antecedenzen der Helena* mentioned in the diary under Dec. 17 is once more *Paralipomenon* No. 99, and this was concluded on that day. While I am glad to see Pniower agree with me in assigning *Paralipomenon* No. 99 to Nov. 10, I have to take exception to a number of other points. *Paralipomenon* No. 63 was not continued (*fortgeführt*) *nach vorn* but in the middle. Nos. 1-6 were probably not lost but left blank, because Goethe was then only concerned about the immediate *Antecedenzen* of Helena. If they had actually been written, it would be a strange coincidence that the schemes of Nov. 9 and 10 (*Paralip.* No. 99) should both begin at the same point. The *Antecedenzen zu Faust* of Dec. 15 do not refer to *Paralipomenon* No. 123 but to its draft of Dec. 15, a document which seems to have escaped Pniower's notice altogether, while the *Einleitung zur Helena*, on the other hand, is surely identical with that *Paralipomenon*. It then remains to explain what is meant by the *Schema zu den Antecedenzen der Helena* of Dec. 17, and why the *Einleitung zur Helena* bears the date of Dec. 17, though, according to the diary, it was not finished till the eighteenth. In this rather perplexing question one thing is perfectly certain, namely that the *Schema zu den Antecedenzen* cannot refer to *Paralipomenon* No. 99, as Pniower maintains, because it would have been to no purpose to finish an old scheme after it had just been superseded by a new one many times as full as it and extending beyond it. The expression *Schema zu den Antecedenzen der Helena* might refer both to the draft of Dec. 15 and to *Paralipomenon* No. 123, for

either calls itself: *Schema . . . die Antecedenzen bekannt zu machen*.¹³ The draft of Dec. 15 does not consist of four folio pages, as I stated in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiv, col. 209, misled by the somewhat indefinite statement in the Weimar edition,—but of eight and a slip of paper, and *Paralipomenon* No. 123 does not fill seven folio pages, but fifteen and a number of slips.

In conclusion I wish to call attention to a very curious similarity which seems to exist between *Paralipomenon* No. 123, ll. 244-256, and a passage in Dante's *Inferno* ix, 55-60. After having saved Faust from the head of Gorgo, which comes to meet them on their way to Proserpina, Manto says:

'Das Gorgonenhaupt nämlich sey ihnen . . . entgegen gezogen . . . hätte Faust darauf geblicket so wär er gleich vernichtet worden, (so dass weder von Leib noch Geist im Universum jemals wieder etwas von ihm wäre zu finden gewesen).'

When the three Furies on the flaming tower of the city of Dis cry *Venga Medusa*, Vergil says:

Volgiti indietro, e tien lo viso chiuso:
Chè se'l Gorgon si mostra, e tu il vedessi,
Nulla sarebbe del tornar mai suso.

Again with Goethe we read:

'Auf einmal deckt Manto ihren Beschützten mit dem Schleyer und drängt ihn vom Wege ab gegen die Felsenwände, (so dass er zu ersticken und zu vergehen fürchtet).'

while Dante continues:

Così disse'l Maestro; ed egli stessi
Mi volse, e non si tenne alle mie mani,
Che con le sue ancor non mi chiudessi.

In either case, therefore, the guide protects the traveller in the lower world from the head of Gorgo, Manto by pushing Faust off the road and covering him with her veil, Vergil by turning Dante and closing his eyes with his hands. Both with Goethe and Dante the protector especially states to the *protégé* that he would never have returned to the upper world again if he had beheld the head, only that Goethe intimates as thorough a destruction as Dante could hardly have conceived. Since we know, moreover, that Goethe was much interested in Karl Streckfuss' Dante translation and that he derived the *Flammenstadt*, l. 11647, from the preceding canto, it seems almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that the passage in the *Inferno*

¹³ Weimar Edit. xv. 2. *Paralipomenon* 123, ll. 285 ff., and variants below. The former is also printed with Pniower, l. c. p. 174.

influenced, if it did not suggest, the meeting with the head of Gorgo in the *Paralipomenon*.

THE PLEA BEFORE PROSERPINA.

Pniower (p. 179) contends that Eckermann's statement of Jan. 15, 1827, that Faust was to make the plea before Proserpina may possibly be correct and may thus disclose an older plan. I must consider this absolutely improbable, if not impossible, for certainly when Goethe composed the last part of *Helena*, and probably even considerably before that time, he intended that Manto should manage Helena's return to life. That is what is hinted at in the words *Der alt-thessalischen Vettel wüsten Geisteszwang*. To say that this refers to Mephistopheles, whom the chorus itself had only a little while before addressed as *Creta's Erzeugte*, seems rather arbitrary. Mephistopheles does not even enter Hades, much less constrain the women to appear on earth. He only takes charge of them some time after they have arrived there. In perfect harmony with this idea the first introduction to *Helena*, which was written June 10, 1826, just after the preliminary completion of the drama, says in so many words that Helena could not be obtained through Mephistopheles, but that *dämonische(n) Sibyllen in den Bergklüften Thessaliens* bring it about through *merkwürdige Verhandlungen* that Proserpina allows Helena to return to life. In accordance with this, again, the schemes of Dec. 15 and 17, which were elaborated only four weeks before Eckermann's conversation, have not Faust but Manto make the plea before Proserpina, and the same is true regarding the three schemes of 1830, the last of which closes with the significant words *Manto ist die Einleitung überlassen*. In the face of all this evidence it does not seem possible to avoid the conclusion that Eckermann made a mistake in his report, as he seems also to have done in another case, to which we shall come presently.

SOME POINTS IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FIFTH ACT.

Eckermann's statement that in December 1830 Goethe devoted his whole interest to the fourth act of *Faust* and the fourth volume of *Wahrheit und Dichtung* is allowed by Pniower (pp. 253 f.) to pass unchallenged. It seems,

however, that 'the fourth volume' caused Eckermann to write 'the fourth act' instead of the fifth; for, as a matter of fact, the fourth act was not begun till February 11 or 12, or even May 4, 1831, May 16 being the date of the main scheme, while the fifth act was completed during that very month of December.¹⁴ It has not yet been determined how much was added during this month, because it is not exactly known how the fifth act closed after the work that had been done on it in 1825. One might feel inclined to think that the state in which this act was left in 1825 is represented by VH2 and that, therefore, Mephistopheles' complaint about the loss of Faust's soul (11825-11831) followed by *Abkündigung* and *Abschied* at that time formed the conclusion.¹⁵ The description of the course of the action as leading *Vom Himmel durch die Welt zur Hölle* in the conversation with Eckermann of May 6, 1827, would favor such a supposition if the occurrence of the statement *dass ein aus schweren Verisungen immerfort zum Bessern aufstrebender Mensch zu erlösen sei* did not point rather strongly to the existence of lines 11936 f.:

"Wer immer strebend sich bemüht
Den können wir erlösen."

In another place (p. 294 f.) Pniower holds that in the points in which the fragment of the *Achilleis* of 1799 agrees with the fifth act of *Faust*, the former draws on the latter and not vice versa. However true this may be of the text, it is not correct as far as the expression *Wimmeln von neuem Volk* is concerned, because the line *Solch ein Gewimmel möcht'ich sehn* is later than VH2, where the last words of Faust are much shorter and do not yet contain that expression. On the other hand the lines

Es kann die Spur von meinen Erdetagen
Nicht in Äonen untergehn.—

which according to a writer in MOD. LANG. NOTES, of last December, col. 476, were written by Goethe *wenige Wochen vor seinem Tode* are found in VH2 and, therefore, belong at least to the year 1825, if indeed they do not date back to the time of his communion with Schiller.

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

¹⁴ Diary, Dec. 13, 1830: *Weitere Ergänzung des Faust*; Dec. 17: *Abschluss von Faust und Mundum desselben. Ich gab ihm [Eckermann] den Abschluss von Faust mit.*

¹⁵ *Paralipomenon* 203 would probably have been inserted before 11825. The greater part of VH2 may go back to the time of Schiller.

VALTEGER, "HENGES" AND THE MAYOR OF QUEENBOROUGH.

In the old account book which Philip Henslowe kept from 1591 to 1609, which Collier printed unsatisfactorily in 1845 for the Shakespeare Society and called "Henslowe's Diary," there are nearly a score of entries concerning a play variously entitled "Valteger," "Vortiger" or (in one case) "Vortemar." These entries disclose that this play was performed for the first time December 4, 1596, and five times more within that month, thrice in January 1597, and once in each of the following three months, with a possible further performance in the following June.¹ In "The Enventary of all the aparell for my Lord Admiralles men tacken the 10 of marche 1598" occurs the "Item, j payer of hosse, and a gerken for Valteger," and in a further inventory for the same company taken three days later we find: "Item, Vartemar sewtte" and "Valteger robe of rich tafitie."² Lastly, Henslowe records:

"Pd at the apoyntment of the companye, unto my sonne, E. Alleyn, for a Boocke called Vortiger, the 20 of novmbr 1601 the some of xxxs."³

This entry points to the revival of the play at that date. I have mentioned the entry of June 1597 as possibly referring to the same play, although in that entry Vortiger is not mentioned, but "Henges." In a note to that passage Collier writes: "The proper title was probably "Hengist," and there is still an existing MS. play called *Hengist, King of Kent*."⁴

If we turn now to Mr. Fleay's list of anonymous plays we find the following passage: "Valteger (Vortigern), 4th Dec. The same play as Hengist, 22nd June 1597, which was not a new play; beyond doubt Middleton's *Mayor of Queenborough*."⁵

This last named play takes its title from the underplot which concerns the humors of a personage named Simon the Tanner. The main story is that of the usurper Vortigern (called Vorteger in the text), who having de-throned his lawful sovereign, the saintly Constantius, seeks the aid of the Saxon princes Hengist and Horsus and is finally overthrown, with his foreign allies, by the rightful heirs, Aurelius and his brother Uter Pendragon. The story is ultimately referable to Geoffrey of Mon-

¹ Henslowe, pp. 83-86 and 89 under "Henges."

² *Ibid.* pp. 273, 274.

³ *Ibid.* p. 204.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 89.

⁵ *Chronicle of the English Drama*, 2, 305.

mouth,⁶ although the immediate source is unquestionably John de Trevisa's translation of Ralph Higden's *Polychronicon*, which had been published by Caxton in 1482, and remains even to the present day the least rare of Caxton's printings.⁷

The theory of Mr. Fleay as to the identity of the three plays *Valteger*, "*Henges*" and *The Mayor of Queenborough* is altogether probable from the important rôles played by the usurper and the Saxon chief in *The Mayor*. From the following circumstance we may consider the identification as certain.

In 1846 Collier printed for the Shakespeare Society the interlude *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom*, to which he added certain "Early Illustrations of Shakespeare and the English Drama." The second of these "illustrations" is entitled "Curious Dramatic Manuscript," and runs in part as follows:

"Understanding that there existed in the library of an ancient family in the East of England an early MS. containing plays by Beaumont and Fletcher, I made further inquiries, and was favored with a sight of the volume. It is of no great antiquity, but may furnish important readings."⁸

Five plays are then mentioned which do not concern us here. The sixth is *Hengist King of Kent* and fortunately for us Collier took the trouble to transcribe the prologue, which runs as follows:

Raynulp[h]. What Raynulp Munk of Chester can
 Raise from his Polichronicon,
 That raised him, as works doe men,
 (To see light so long parted with agen)
 That best may please this round faire ring 5
 With sparkleing judgments circled in
 Shall produce, if all my power[s]
 Can wyn the grace of too poore howres:
 Well apaide I goe to rest,
 Ancient storyes have bene best, 10
 Fashions that are now called ner
 Have bene worne by more then you;
 Elder times have us'd ye same,
 Though these new ones get ye name,
 So in story whats now told 15
 That takes not part with days of old?
 Then to prove times mutuall glorye
 Ioyne new times love to old times storye, *Exit*.

These eighteen lines, save for a few trifling variants, form the prologue to *The Mayor of*

⁶ *Historia Regum Britanniae*, translation ed. Giles, 1842, p. 111 ff.

⁷ The Story of Vortigern is told at some length in the *Polychronicon* Book v. *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain*, Higden, 5, 255-277.

⁸ *Shakespeare Society Publications*, 1846, p. 85.

Queenborough as printed in the works of Middleton, a fact of which Collier was evidently unaware, and which apparently Mr. Bullen did not know in editing his—the latest—edition of Middleton. As the variants are several of them such as to require the transcription of more than one line, I also transcribe the prologue in the version of Mr. Bullen's edition.

Ray. What Raynulp[h], monk of Chester can
 Raise from his Polychronicon,
 That raiseth him, as works do men,
 To see long-parted light agen,
 That best may please this round fair ring,
 With sparkling diamonds circled in,
 I shall produce. If all my powers
 Can win the grace of two poor hours,
 Well apaid I go to rest.
 Ancient stories have been best;
 Fashions, that are now call'd new,
 Have been worn by more than you;
 Elder times have used the same,
 Though these new ones get the name:
 So in story what now told
 That takes not part with days of old?
 Then to approve time's mutual glory,
 Join new time's love to old time's story.⁹

The italics indicate variants from the text given by Collier and are, as they stand, sufficient to show that Mr. Bullen's is a later version. It would be interesting to learn what has become of the manuscript, the whereabouts of which Collier so vaguely indicated, as it contained besides two well known plays of Fletcher's Sir William Barclay's *The Lost Lady*, published in 1638, *The Inconstant Lady* by Arthur Wilson, who died in 1652, and *The Lovers' Hospital*, of which I can find no mention elsewhere. It may be added that Mr. Fleay says that Wilson's play was published in 1814, although a MS. of it is supposed to have been destroyed by Warburton's cook.¹⁰

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE OLDEST SCENES IN GOETHE'S FAUST.

I.

IN its general outlines, the evolution of Goethe's *Faust*—from those early days when, as the poet recalls in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, "die Puppenspielfabel klang und summt gar vieltönig in mir wieder," to the closing months of his life, when he put the last touches to the Second

⁹ Bullen's *Middleton*, 2, 5.

¹⁰ *Chronicle of the English Drama*, 2, 278.

Part—has long been familiar to us, but it is only within recent years that the first chapter of the history of *Faust*, namely that on its origin and earliest stages, has had something more than hypotheses to deal with. Attempts to establish a chronology for Goethe's work on *Faust* in the period before he left Frankfurt for Weimar towards the end of 1775, date virtually from Wilhelm Scherer's papers in *Aus Goethes Frühzeit (Quellen und Forschungen, 34, Strassburg 1879)*, and the same critic's *Betrachtungen über Goethes Faust (Goethe-Jahrb. 6 [1885], 231 ff., reprinted in Aufsätze über Goethe, Berlin 1886, 293 ff.)*—papers which for long were held up as warning examples of the abuse of the philological method. The tendency, however, of recent criticism of *Faust* is to go back to Scherer, or, at least, to show a better appreciation for the valuable side of Scherer's work on *Faust*.¹ A new basis for the whole subject was afforded by E. Schmidt's important discovery in 1887 of the Göchhausen MS. of the pre-Weimarian *Faust*, the so-called *Urfaust (Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt, nach der Göchhausenschen Abschrift herausgegeben von E. Schmidt. 1-4. Abdruck. Weimar 1887-99)*. On this new basis the most important, or at least, the most voluminous contribution to the study of *Faust* is J. Collin's *Goethes Faust in seiner ältesten Gestalt (Frankfurt a. M., 1896)*. The chronological deductions of Collin's work are unfortunately its weakest side; they are too obviously based on an *a priori* theory that *Faust* in its first stage was wholly written in 1774 and 1775:

der älteste Faust ist anzusehen als das Produkt einer nach jahrelanger innerer Arbeit rasch und kräftig hervorbrechenden dichterischen Tätigkeit (p. 122).

Cf. G. Pniower's review in the *Anzeiger für deutsches Alterthum*, 24 (1898), 382 ff., and a paper comparing Collin's standpoint with Scherer's by S. W. Cutting in MOD. LANG. NOTES, 10 (1895), 464 ff. Among the ablest and most penetrating critics of the *Urfaust* is Otto Pniower, to whose numerous contributions repeated reference will be made in the following pages; the most important of these is the volume which he published a few months ago

¹ Cp. Prof. Calvin Thomas's paper on Scherer's Methods as a Critic of *Faust* in the *Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America*, 2 (1887), 92 ff.

under the title *Goethes Faust: Zeugnisse und Excursus zu seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Berlin: 1899), an indispensable handbook for every student of *Faust*. In 1897 J. Niejahr came forward in partial support of Scherer's standpoint with an article in *Euphorion*, which in turn called forth a new philological investigation of the opening monologue by F. Saran in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*. Saran also supports in the main Scherer's conclusions with regard to the construction of this monologue. These papers, to which I shall have occasion to add several others in the course of the present article, give a general idea of the attitude of recent *Faust-Forschung* to the question of the "oldest *Faust*." A summary of the whole controversy is to be found in the introduction to Schmidt's edition of the Göchhausen MS., which in the two last editions has become a veritable introduction to the entire subject of *Faust* Philology. Prof. Schmidt's own standpoint is in the main a conservative one; as far as chronology is concerned, it is summed up in the words: *Faust-dichtung vor 1773 oder erst 1774 ist wiederum nur im Bereiche der Gedanken, nicht der gestaltenden Ausführung zu suchen (p. xiii)*. The object of the present paper is, on the basis of these recent developments of *Faust* criticism, to suggest some kind of working hypothesis of the actual beginnings of Goethe's masterpiece.

II.

Prof. Schmidt's view is virtually that to which we are led by the direct evidence bearing on the origin of Goethe's *Faust*. Leaving aside all evidence which only proves in a general way that Goethe was engaged on the poem in 1775—a fact which was, of course, established by the discovery of the Göchhausen *Faust*—we might conveniently arrange the remaining evidence in three groups.

I. Contemporary Evidence. a. Gotter's lines to Goethe (in Pniower's list [*Goethes Faust*, Berlin 1899] No. 7):

Schick mir dafür den Doktor Faust,
Sobald Dein Kopf ihn ausgebraut!

which point to the date Summer 1773. This date is corroborated by the letter in the *Italienische Reise*, dated March 1, 1788 (Pniower, No. 56), in which Goethe refers to his plan of writing *Faust* fifteen years before. b. Boie's

statement of October 15, 1774 (Pniower, No. 12): *Sein Dr. Faust ist fast fertig, und scheint mir das grösste und eigenthümlichste von Allem.* c. Knebel's letter of December 23, 1774, to Bertuch (Pniower, No. 13): *Ich habe einen Haufen Fragmente von ihm, unter andern zu einem Doctor Faust, wo ganz ausnehmend herrliche Scenen sind.*

II. The second group of evidence dates from the years 1811-13: it is that of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* and of the plans and sketches connected with that work. a. In Book ten of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (Werke, 27, 320) Goethe connects the origin of *Faust* with his friendship with Herder in Strassburg (September 1770-April 1771), but at the same time states that nothing was written then (Pniower, No. 3). b. In a sketch of the contents of Books 9-11 (probably dictated April 2, 1811) are the words, referring to the latter part of his sojourn in Strassburg, (Pniower, No. 4): *Fortsetzung der übrigen Natur- und Medicinischen Studien. Unendliche Zerstreuung. Vorbild zum Schüler in Faust* (Werke, 28, 360). c. In Book twelve (Werke, 28, 98) Goethe discusses his visit to Darmstadt in the spring of 1772 and refers to *Faust* as being then in an advanced condition (see, however, Pniower, No. 5). To this group of evidence might be added; d. Jacobi's letter to Goethe of April 12, 1791 (Pniower, No. 79): *Von Faust kannte ich beynahe schon alles . . . Wie ich vor sechzehn Jahren fühlte . . .* Jacobi was a guest of the Goethe family in January, and again at the beginning of March, 1774.

III. The third, and naturally least trustworthy group of evidence, is that of Goethe's correspondence and conversations in the last years of his life. a. In a letter to Zelter of May 11, 1820 Goethe associates the composition of an important part of *Faust* with *Satyros* and *Prometheus* (Pniower, N. 326). b. In a conversation with Eckermann (February 10, 1829) he connected *Faust* with *Werther* (Pniower, No. 692), and again c. in the *Annalen* it is mentioned along with the *Puppenspiele* and the *Prolog zu Bahrdr* (Pniower, No. 2). To these items has also to be added d. the statement, doubtless based on some authority, of Eckermann and Riemer, ascribing *die ältesten Scenen des Faust* to the years 1773-74 (Pniower, No. 9). In later life Goethe was thus clearly

inclined to date the origin of the poem earlier than our direct evidence justifies us in dating it. This is also seen in e. the letter to Zelter of June 1, 1831, in which he speaks of having conceived *Faust* in his twentieth year (that is, 1769) (Pniower, No. 874), and again, f. in the letter to W. von Humboldt of March 17, 1832, in which he speaks of his occupation with *Faust* extending over more than sixty years (that is, at least to 1771).

Of internal evidence, the influence of Herder's *Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* (published at Easter, 1774) on ll. 72 ff. of the *Urfaust* (Pniower, No. 10) is the only fact sufficiently well established to afford a date for any part of the poem earlier than 1775. Thus, as far as actual proofs are concerned, we are forced to the conclusion that *Faust* may have been begun in 1773, but that we have complete certainty only for the years 1774 and 1775.

III.

The question as to when Goethe began *Faust*, and what are the oldest scenes in the drama, is, however, by no means so easily disposed of. Even if we ignore completely—which we are hardly justified in doing—the second and third groups of evidence, the poem is still of too composite a nature to have been written off, as it stands in the Göchhausen MS., between 1773 and 1775. That MS. certainly does not represent the earliest form of the *Faust* poem any more than it contains all of the poem that Goethe brought with him to Weimar (see O. Pniower, *Zwei Probleme des Urfaust*, in *Vierteljahrschrift f. Littgesch.*, 2 [1889], 146 ff. and R. Kögel, *Der vorweimarische Faust*, in the same volume, 545 ff.). Evidence such as that which Collin (*loc. cit.*) brings forward to support his theory that the *Urfaust* was written off as it stands, in 1774-75, proves no more than that Goethe was too good a poet not to weave his older plans and materials skillfully into the new whole.

There can hardly be any question that the oldest part of Goethe's *Faust* is the opening monologue; here, if anywhere, must have been the beginning of the drama (cf. E. Schmidt, *Urfaust*, p. xxxv). B. Seuffert (*Die älteste Scene im Faust* in the *Vjs. f. Littg.* 4 [1891], 339 ff.) attempted to claim the "Mephistopheles Student" scene as a parody written in

Leipzig. But just as there could have been no Faust without the opening monologue, so there could have been no Mephistopheles without Faust. And this opening monologue, as Scherer first suggested, and as has recently received confirmation from J. Niejahr (*Kritische Untersuchungen zu Goethes Faust: I. Älteste Gestalt*, in *Euphorion*, 4 (1897), 272 ff.) and F. Saran (*Die Einheit des ersten Faustmonologs* in the *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.* 30 [1898], 508 ff.), is no homogeneous whole. That there is a break of plan just before Faust opens the book of Nostradamus is, I think, no longer open to question. Scherer placed the break after line 74; Saran with more probability places it after l. 72, regarding the four lines

73-76: Umsonst dass trocknes Sinnen hier
Die heiligen Zeichen dir erklärt
Ihr schwebt ihr Geister neben mir
Antwortet mir wenn ihr mich hört.

as the transition to the later plan, according to which Faust conjures the spirit, not in the open country, but in his own room. We may not feel justified in seeing with Niejahr traces of an originally out-of-door scene in the present *Erdgeist* scene, but there is little doubt that Goethe's original intention was to make Faust evoke the *Erdgeist* in the open country. Hardly less convincing seems to me the first break which Scherer insisted upon; namely, that between the matter-of-fact beginning of the monologue and the poetic, Swedenborgian (see M. Morris, *Swedenborg im Faust*, in *Euphorion*, 6 [1899], 491 ff.) apostrophe to the moon:

33 ff: O sähest du voller Mondenschein . . .

It would be absurd, of course, to say (cf. Schmidt, *l. c.*, p. xxviii) that a poet of Goethe's genius could not have written even the whole opening monologue of *Faust* with all its varied tones, and that in a single day, but the question has to be considered in view of the fact that the first scene of the *Urfaust* falls naturally into two parts, one of which is uniformly pervaded by a pantheistic conception of nature, by a constant antithesis of nature and spirit, while the other is in a tone of dry, cynical humor. The lines of the monologue which are completely free from this Herder-Swedenborgian spirit are obviously 1-28, not 1-32, for the last four lines of the first section of the monologue,

29-32: Dass ich erkenne was die Welt
Im innersten zusammenhält
Schau alle Wirkungskraft und Saamen
Und thu nicht mehr in Worten kramen.

besides simply enlarging on the preceding lines, have already a touch of what I should call the new spirit; and again, the lines descriptive of Faust's *Manerloch* (45-56). Apart from the fact that these latter lines are in the same tone as the first twenty-eight lines, it is worth noticing that the description they give of the *enges gothisches Zimmer* is not imagined for a night scene when the room is so dimly lighted that the moonlight pours into it, and the details of its furnishings would not be visible, but for daylight,

47-48: Wo selbst das liebe Himmels Licht
Trüb durch gemahlte Scheiben bricht.

The superscription *Nacht* of the scene is probably to be associated with the lines 33 ff. I would thus claim as all that remains to us of the earliest stage of Faust's monologue, ll. 1-28, then, after a gap, ll. 45-56. In addition to these forty lines, ll. 65-68,

Flieh! Auf! hinaus in's weite Land!
Und dies geheimnisvolle Buch
Von Nostradamus eigner Hand
Ist dir das nicht Geleitet genug?

and the last four lines of the scene (165-168), which form the transition to the *Faust-Wagner* scene, were perhaps also taken over from the first rough sketch of the drama.

The next scene of the *Urfaust*, that between Faust and Wagner, belongs to the oldest scheme of the drama. There was a Wagner in one of the *Puppenspiele*. The satiric tone of the scene stands out in sharp contrast to the spirit of the *Erdgeist* scene, and certainly harmonizes better with that part of the monologue which I have claimed as oldest. At the same time, as R. Huther (*Herder im Faust*, in *Zeits. f. deut. Phil.* 21 [1889], 329 ff.) has pointed out, the influence of Herder permeates the scene, although it is surely unnecessary to go to Herder's *Provinzialblätter* for parallelisms. This part of *Faust* has not yet been subjected to the careful philological scrutiny to which the foregoing and the succeeding scenes have been subjected, but I doubt if much would be gained by such an investigation. As the scene stands, it has a poetic justification owing to the contrast it affords to the *Erdgeist* scene, but it seems to me more than probable that it was

written before the spirit-conjuring scene, and was intended to precede them. The latter, as originally planned, would, of course, have demanded a change of scene, while the *Faust-Wagner* scene could only have taken place in Faust's room. Faust's interview with the *Erdgeist*, to mention another small point, would have hardly suggested itself to Wagner as *deklamieren*: it points rather to the scene having been immediately preceded by the original monologue.

And upon this *Faust-Wagner* scene follows in the Göchhausen *Faust* the scene between Mephistopheles and the Student, incontestably one of the oldest elements in the poem. As we have seen, it has even been claimed as dating back to Goethe's sojourn in Leipzig, but as E. Schmidt has with justice pointed out (*loc. cit.* p. xlii), the tone of the verses would not have been approved of by the Leipzig Goethe. On the other hand, Leipzig memories are fresh in it; the figure of the young *Fuchs* receiving advice about food and lodgings seems more likely a Leipzig reminiscence than a Strassburg one. That, however, Goethe's Strassburg experience had much to do with the scene is to be inferred from the words, already quoted, in a sketch plan for his autobiography: *Vorbild zum Schüler in Faust*. Pniower (*Die Schülerszene im Urfaust*, in *Vjs. f. Littg.* 4 [1891], 317 ff.) has subjected this scene to a searching and, in the main, convincing analysis, with the result that he distinguishes in it two parts, the first consisting of lines 249-338, the second of the last one hundred and three lines (341-444), the two parts being loosely connected by the verses

339-340: Ihr seyd da auf der rechten Spur,

Doch müsst ihr euch nicht zerstreuen lassen.

The first of these parts Pniower ascribes to the winter of 1771-72, the second to 1775.

The position of the *Auerbachs Keller* scene in the chronology of *Faust* is less easy to determine. Its vivid Leipzig memories and associations might lead us to find here, as in the preceding scene, an early Leipzig constituent of the poem. This theory—which B. Seuffert (*Vjs. f. Littg.* 1 [1888], 53 ff.) attempted to maintain, but afterwards rejected—is however, indefensible. As the scene stands, it could certainly not have been written in Leipzig. At the same time, the immediateness of its de-

scriptions and its local color point strongly to the fact that it was sketched while Goethe's Leipzig memories were still fresh. In a letter to Auguste von Stolberg of September 17, 1775, Goethe wrote (Pniower, No. 21): *ich machte eine Scene an meinem Faust*, and in the same letter, a few lines later, compared himself to a *Ratte, die Gift gefressen hat*. This has generally been accepted as giving a clue to the date of this scene. Another and slighter piece of evidence, is the resemblance between a verse which Goethe wrote in his Diary on June 15, 1775, and the lines at the beginning of the scene,

179-180: Uns ist gar kannibalisches wohl
Als wie fünfhundert Säuen!

(Pniower, No. 20.) But as Pniower (*l.c.*) has shown, there is no reason why this and the *Ratte* song should not have been later additions. For that part, the evidence, however strong, that Goethe was engaged on "*Auerbachs Keller*" at all when he wrote to Auguste von Stolberg, is by no means conclusive. The academic freshness and specifically Leipzig color of the scene is, I think, strongly in favor of the hypothesis that "*Auerbachs Keller*" in some shape formed a constituent part of the oldest *Faust*.

IV.

To sum up the conclusions which, it seems to me, we are justified in drawing as to the oldest form of Goethe's *Faust*: 1) There is no ground for assuming that Goethe had written a line about Faust before the winter of 1771-72; at least, if he had, nothing of it had passed into the *Urfaust* as we know it from the Göchhausen MS. But in Leipzig Goethe's thoughts had at least been directed to the magician Faust (cf. the references to Faust in the *Mitschuldigen*: Pniower, No. 1); the real *Auerbachs Keller*, with its pictures of the saga, had brought Faust visibly before him, and Lessing's fragment (1759) had suggested the literary possibilities of the theme. In 1769 his interest in alchemy probably again brought Faust near to him. But we may accept his own statement in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* as the true one, that nothing was written on *Faust* until after his acquaintance with Herder, until his return from Strassburg to Frankfurt in 1771. The fact that Goethe's earliest verses in the

Knittel rhythm of Hans Sachs² belong to this year is additional evidence that it is the earliest date to which we can ascribe work on *Faust*. To the winter of 1771-72 belongs then, it seems to me, the oldest form of the *Faust* poem; this oldest form was what might be described as a purely academic *Faust* on the basis of the puppet-play. In addition to the evidence of detail I would emphasize, on one hand, the vividness of the academic scenes, which precludes too long a separation from Goethe's own experiences in Leipzig and Strassburg; on the other hand, the manifest changes of aim and plan, not to speak of the changes in poetic style, which demanded a separation, not of months, but of years, between the earliest form and the later additions.

This oldest academic *Faust* opened with a monologue of which I have specified how much seems to me to have passed over into the Göchhausen version. Upon this first scene—which may have included a spirit-conjuring scene, but was more probably a monologue and nothing more—followed the *Faust-Wagner* scene. The third scene of the fragment embraced the first half of the *Mephistopheles-Student* scene. As a fourth scene, there may have been an early form of the *Auerbachs Keller* scene, but it was probably only a roughly sketched-out plan, which took clearer form later, when Goethe had a better idea of what he intended to do with Faust after bringing him and Mephistopheles together. It is very improbable that any of the *Gretchen* scenes existed before the year 1774; it is quite out of the question that Goethe had even dreamt of making his Faust the hero of a love tragedy as early as the winter of 1771-72.

JOHN G. ROBERTSON.

University of Strassburg, Germany.

NOTES ON ENGLISH VOWELS.

I. Gradation in 'year' and other Nouns.

WE are accustomed to the process of modern gradation (German *ablaut*) in particles, pronouns, and some verbs, for example, *be*, *have*, *can*, etc. In substantives and adjectives it is not so obvious and for that very reason deserves attention. In *histor'ical*/*his'tery*/*his'*-

² *Werke*, iv, 2, 9, in an epistle to Merk. Cf. Pniower in *Vjs. f. Littg.* 4 (1891), 333.

t'ry les'son, and in *hick'ery*/*hick''ry nut'* we have a gradation series with *o/e/zero*. In *art'*/*artis'tic*, as in OE. *ān'*/*an*, we have an *ā/a* series, which in early modern English 'on(e) feather'/'birds of a feather' appears as *ō/a*, just as the Indo-European series *ā/a* appears as *ō/a* in Germanic. In *day/holiday/Monday* we have the series *ē/e/i*. The same series is found also in words in *-ate*. Verbs of this class, being generally followed by a weak syllable (see *Publications of the M. L. A. of A.* xii, 322), have considerable stress on the *a*, which thus appears as *ē*, for example, *separate* and so *separated*. The same is true of substantives and adjectives that frequently stand at the end of a sentence (see my *German Orthography and Phonology*, § 278, a), for example, *vulgate*, *mandate*, *cognate*, *prostrate*, etc. But adjectives that are usually used attributively, and so stand before a syllable with heavy stress, have *e* or *i*, for example, *separate*, *delicate*, etc., and so most substantives of two syllables: *senate*, *pirate*, *prelate*, *frigate*, *palate*, etc.; those having a weak syllable before the *-ate* vary between *ē* and *e*, for example, *candidate*, *reprobate*, *aggregate*, *certificate*. Here belong also the cases of lengthening in open syllables provided not more than one syllable follows, and the cases of shortening if more than one syllable follows (see Luick, *Anglia*, xx, 337 ff.); to the examples given by Luick we may add ME. *vine*/*vinegre*, *āker*/*akerspire* (see column 283), and *Mary* with *ē*/*Maryland* with modern shortening of *ē* to *e*. The cases of *æ > ē > ā/a*, for example, in *pāss*/*pæssage* and *pæssenger*, *bāth*/*Kætherine*, *photogrāph*/*photographic*, I shall deal with in another paper.

My chief object in calling attention to modern gradation in nouns is to explain the present diversity in the pronunciation of *year*. This word has two pronunciations, one with long *i* (more or less low before the *r*) and one with long *æ*. The first, which rimes with *fear*, is almost universal in America, the second, which rimes with *her*, is getting the upperhand in England. This difference of vowel is due to gradation, the strong form generally maintaining itself with us, and the old weak form crowding it out in England and parts of eastern New England.

The strong form occurs in such phrases as 'in a year,' 'twice a year,' 'the last day of the year,' and often in 'next year,' 'this year,' etc. The weak form was, however, very frequent, especially after a numeral, thus 'ten years old,' 'three years after,' 'new-year's calls,' etc.

Before ME. *ē* became the modern *ī*, the strong form of 'year' was *jēr* and the weak form *jer*, later *jār*. In time the strong *jēr* became *jir*, as *fēr* 'fear' became *fir*. When in England the weak form began to displace the strong in stressed positions, its vowel lengthened, as in stressed *her*:—

weak: (*hə*)r, *jār*;

strong: *hār*, *jār*.

In America the normal strong form *jir*, for the most part, drove out the old weak *jār*. In time, however, a new weak form arose with *i* shortened from *ī*, and it is this that is now heard in expressions like 'He's *ten* years old,' etc. See also the following paper.

II. The Vowel of 'wind.'

The normal development of the vowel of OE. *wind* 'wind,' like that of *windan* 'to wind,' would have been *i>ī>ai*, and to a certain extent this development went on unchecked. This was particularly true when the word was stressed and at the end of the stress-group. Thus, in rime, where these conditions prevail, we find *wind*, and this poetic usage continues to this day, chiefly because there is nothing to rime with *wind* except an occasional name like *Ind* or *Jenny Lind*.

But the normal development received two powerful checks. In the first place, the word is very common in the contrasted expressions 'north wind,' 'south wind,' 'east wind,' 'west wind,' where it has but little stress. This produced the gradation *i/i*, modern English *ai/i*. See the preceding paper.

But the same shortening was brought about wherever the *ind*, though heavily stressed, stood before other consonants in compounds or derivatives. *Windward* and OE. *windwian* 'to blow,' modern *winnow*, are such derivatives; of compounds there are many. I need cite only the most common ones: *windpipe*, *window* (wind-eye), *windmill*, *windrow*, *windbreak*, *windfall*, *windstorm*, *windbound*, etc. Compare also the plant-names *windgall*, *windflower*, *windplant*, etc., also *windhover*, *wind-*

sucker and the like. The verb 'to wind' suffered exactly the same shortening in the compound *windlass* and the derivative *windle*.

III. The Etymology of 'acrospire.'

Acrospire is at present the most common form of a word that appears as *akerspire*, *ackerspire* and *ackersprit*, *acrospire*. Murray refers to *ackerspyre* and *akerspire* as obsolete or dialectic, and derives the word

"from Greek *ἄκρο-* [combining form of *ἄκρος* a. terminal, highest, topmost; sb. a tip, point, extremity, peak, summit]—*σπείρειν*—anything twisted, or *σπείρειν* to sow."

Other dictionaries contain much the same explanation, but not the hesitating suggestion of the possible relation to *σπείρειν*. Skeat ignores the word, probably on the ground that it is a recent scientific term like *acrospore* and its etymology obvious. Wright alone has got on the track of the truth and suggests relation to *spire* 'a spike or blade.'

The earliest record that I know of the word is *aker-spirc*, Surflot and Mark, *Country Farme*, 1616; the next *acherspyre*, Skinner, 1671; the third, *Acrospire*, Grew *Anat. Plants*, 1674. The fact that the word has been in common use among English farmers and malters, and that for nearly three hundred years, makes it impossible that it is an artificial product of the modern botanist. Moreover, the form *akerspire* is much the older and has nothing Greek about it at all. In fact, it is clearly a pure English word and got a Greek look only as a result of a natural phonetic change. The word is a compound of *aker* (the older and more reasonable spelling of *acre*) and *spire*. The earlier meaning of *acre* is 'field' (still in vogue in Yorkshire, Norfolk, etc.; cf. also *acrestones* 'field stones,' *acremould* 'finely tilled earth,' etc.), and the meaning of *spire* is 'a sprout or shoot, as a spire of grass or of wheat,' as Chaucer says: *An ook cometh of a litel spyr*. An *akerspire* is such a sprout as comes up from the ground in a wheat field, in distinction from a sprout that comes later from the plant itself. It is thus the first shoot from the seed, 'the first leaf that appears when corn sprouts,' to quote Lindley's definition. By malters it was used of the sprouting of malt, cf. the following from Maunders *Scient. Treas.* 443: 'By the aid of moisture, the barley is made to germinate, that is to put forth roots and almost

its acrospire or first spout; and by the aid of fire, the roots are destroyed and the acrospire prevented from bursting the skin.'

Let us now see how the change in form came about. *Aker* originally had short *a*, which regularly became long in the open syllable of the dissyllabic word, as it did in *baker*, but as regularly remained short in the trisyllabic form *akerspire*, as it did in *Saturday*, see col. 280. If the *a* was at any time long in *akerspire*, it became so by analogy to the simplex *aker*, as *bakery* got its long *a* from *baker*; the history of the word, however, makes it unlikely that it ever became long. *Akerspire* contains a congestion of consonants in the middle of the word, which was relieved by the metathesis of the *er* to *re*: *akrespire* or *acrespire*. Just such a metathesis has taken place in the change of *larynx*=*larinks* to the vulgar *larnyx*. In *acrespire* the *e* spells an obscure vowel that might as correctly be spelled with almost any vowel, and so we are not surprised to find *acrospire*. This spelling was doubtless favored because of its classical look, and in time led to the bogus classical derivation that has figured in our dictionaries ever since. Compare the similar classical spelling *anchor* for the older *anker*.

The form *acrospit* is a similar formation, but in this case the second member of the word is a derivative of *sprout*, compare OE. *sprytte*, *sprytling*, etc., 'sprout,' 'shoot,' 'twig,' and *spryttan* 'to sprout' or 'germinate.'

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

THE SOURCES OF CORNEILLE'S TRAGEDY *La Mort de Pompée*.

THERE are many reasons why Corneille's tragedy *La Mort de Pompée* should be of interest to us. It belongs to the best period of his literary career, being written in 1643 immediately after *Polyculte*, and just before *Le Menteur*. He composed it for the purpose of proving to his critics that he had not lost the secret of that majestic diction which they had admired in *Cinna*, and which seemed to be lacking in *Polyculte*.

The object of the present study is to consider the sources of the play and to show the method of Corneille in shaping his material into acts

and scenes. Incidentally it may afford glimpses of the attitude of a tragic author of the seventeenth century toward his material and show how a classic tragedy could be composed.

The original edition of the play of the year 1644 was preceded by an *Épître au Lecteur*, containing the following passage:

Si je voulois faire ici ce que j'ai fait en mes deux derniers ouvrages, et te donner le texte ou l'abrégé des auteurs, dont cette histoire est tirée, afin que tu pusses remarquer en quoi je m'en serois écarté pour l'accomoder au théâtre, je ferois un avant-propos dix fois plus long que mon poëme, et j'aurois à rapporter des livres entiers de presque tous ceux qui ont écrit l'histoire romaine. Je me contenterai de t'avertir que celui dont je me suis le plus servi a été le poëte Lucain, dont la lecture m'a rendu si amoureux de la force de ses pensées et de la majesté de son raisonnement, qu'afin d'en enrichir notre langue, j'ai fait cet effort pour réduire en poëme dramatique ce qu'il a traité en épique.

The later editions of the years 1648, 1652 and 1655 contained in addition a list of the lines translated from Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Both the *Épître au Lecteur* and the list of loans from Lucan were replaced by him in the edition of the year 1660 by the well-known *Examen* which he prefixed to the plays that had appeared up to that time. Here he speaks of our tragedy as follows:

À bien considérer cette pièce, je ne crois pas qu'il y en aye sur le théâtre où l'histoire soit plus conservée et plus falsifiée tout ensemble. Elle est si connue, que je n'ai osé en changer les événements; mais il s'y en trouvera peu qui soient arrivés comme je les fais arriver.

And then follows a discussion of the principal alterations, which he has introduced.

The attempt to separate the invention of Corneille from the historical data, which he accepted, seems never to have been undertaken seriously. The only study of the play to my knowledge is the brief *Notice* by Marty-Laveaux in his edition of the works of Corneille.¹ He points to the early love of Corneille for Lucan, made evident by the fact that when still a student in the Jesuit College at Rouen he obtained a prize for a translation into French verse of a portion of the *Pharsalia*;² and he

¹ *Les Grands Écrivains de la France*, Vol. iv.

² It has since been shown that the authority which Marty-Laveaux accepts here is untrustworthy, and that metrical translations of Latin and Greek authors did not form a part of the Jesuit curriculum of the time. Cp. Bouquet, *Points obscurs de la Vie de Corneille*, pp. 17-18.

accepts his confession of indebtedness to Lucan in the composition of *Pompée*. However, he maintains that the idea of dramatizing certain portions of the poem did not come to him from his love for Lucan:

Il la doit bien évidemment à Chaulmer, auteur d'une traduction abrégée des *Annales* de Baronius, qui a publié en 1638, chez Antoine de Sommaville, un des libraires de notre poète, *La Mort de Pompée*, tragédie.

We shall show later that this idea rests entirely on a gratuitous assumption. He mentions further that Garnier's tragedy *Cornélie* (1574) was of service to Corneille for the composition of Act V, Scene 2, a fact which had been first pointed out by Voltaire. It will be shown that here also the information of Marty-Laveaux was incomplete.

Picot in his *Bibliographie Cornélienne* (1876) accepts and repeats these statements, and adds Velleius Paterculus as an additional source. This addition is evidently made upon the authority of the passages from this author containing pen pictures of Cæsar and Pompey cited by Corneille in the first edition of the play. An examination of them, however, reveals the fact that they were introduced by Corneille for their own intrinsic literary value, and not because he considered them as sources of the play. If they have influenced the composition, this influence is not apparent.

It is curious that Marty-Laveaux, who had opened his copy of Amyot's translation of Plutarch, did not see the close similarity which exists between it and our tragedy. Evidently he trusted Corneille too literally and did not look very closely. In the present study it will be proved that Corneille has made extensive use of Amyot's *Plutarch*, and that notwithstanding his reference to the large historical library "dont cette histoire est tirée" his immediate sources were quite limited. A certain number of scenes he has invented outright; for these it is unnecessary to seek an authority. In the main body of the play he has used Lucan and the account of the death of Pompey in Plutarch's *Lives of Pompey and Cæsar*. Outside of these two authors, he seems to have made but little direct use of other sources, with the exception of Garnier's *Cornélie* from which he has imitated two scenes.

To have a basis for our argument, it will be

necessary to review briefly the events which form the center of the tragedy.

The death of Pompey is the main episode of the end of the second civil war, which had begun with Cæsar's crossing of the Rubicon in 49 B. C. When the news of this decisive step reached Rome, Pompey at once left the city, and after having tried in vain to gain a foothold in the Southern portion of the peninsula, he left Italy altogether and crossed over into Epirus. Cæsar at first turned his attention to the army threatening him in Spain. Only when that had been beaten at Ilerda, did he prepare to follow his enemy into Greece. After some preliminary skirmishes, Pompey was foolish enough to follow Cæsar into Thessaly, where he was completely routed at Pharsalus in the year 48. He was now forced to flee for his life. Stopping at the island of Lesbos to pick up his wife Cornelia, who was there expecting to hear news of his victory, he sailed along the coast of Asia, endeavoring to find the necessary aid to repair his adverse fortune. However, closely pressed by the pursuit of Cæsar, it became necessary for him to find a safe place of refuge. He decided upon Egypt, whose king Ptolomæus Dionysius was beholden to him, since he had been instrumental in protecting the throne of his father. Some years before when the latter, Ptolomæus Auletes, had been driven from his country, he had gone for aid to Rome. Pompey had espoused his cause, and though the Senate had refused to grant the help demanded, he had personally entrusted Gabinius with the matter, and Ptolemy had been reinstated. He now believed that gratitude for this timely aid would insure him a safe hiding-place in Egypt. He knew that the young King was encamped at Pelusium, being then at war with his sister Cleopatra.

When Ptolomæus Auletes had died he had decreed by testament that Ptolomæus Dionysius should reign in conjunction with his sister, on condition that they should marry each other, but Dionysius had objected to the terms of the testament.

As soon as the news of Pompey's approach reached the Egyptian camp at Pelusium, the young King assembled a council of his ministers, and deliberated with them upon the most expedient plan to be followed under the cir-

cumstances. It was finally decided that Pompey should be sacrificed for the purpose of gaining the good will of the pursuing Cæsar. The execution of this resolution was entrusted to Achilles, who took with him his chosen accomplices, and in a small boat went out to meet Pompey's galley. Under pretense that the sea was too shallow to allow a close approach to the shore Pompey was persuaded to step into this boat, which was to bring him into the presence of the King. Its progress was eagerly watched by Cornelia and Pompey's friends from the galley, which remained at anchor.

When it had reached the shore, they could see that Achilles drew his sword, and dealt Pompey a mortal blow. His head was then cut off and carried ashore, while the body was thrown into the sea. Cornelia, wild with grief, made vain attempts to throw herself into the sea, but she was prevented by her friends, who raised the anchor and fled in terror. The body of Pompey was washed ashore, and burned to ashes by a faithful friend.

Three days later Cæsar arrived in Egypt and upon landing the head of Pompey was presented to him. The result was not what the Egyptians had anticipated. He turned in sorrow from the sight, and received the ring of Pompey with tears in his eyes. He then set about to decide the quarrel between Ptolemy and his sister. He espoused her cause, read publicly the testament of their father and insisted upon its execution. This decision precipitated a war which lasted for the space of a year. During this period the eunuch Photinus, the King's privy counselor and instigator of the murder of Pompey, planned a treacherous plot against Cæsar. It was discovered, however, and its author was killed. Achilles, his companion, escaped by flight and joined the army of Ptolemy. Cæsar was now surrounded in a certain quarter of Alexandria, known as the Brucheion, and could maintain himself only by burning the Egyptian fleet in the harbor. During this conflagration a part of the celebrated Library was also destroyed. Finally he was reinforced by Mithridates, king of Pergamos, and in a decisive battle Ptolemy was overcome and came to his death by drowning during his flight. Cæsar now made Egypt a Roman province, and married Cleopatra to her second brother Ptolemy XV. Then he turned

against Pharnaces, king of Pontus, whom he conquered in so short a time that he could send to Rome the famous message: "*Veni, vidi, vici.*" Soon after his departure Cleopatra gave birth to a son, who was called Cæsareon after his father.

After a short stay in Rome, Cæsar next turned against his enemies in Africa. Sextus Pompeius and Metellus Scipio, the great Pompey's second father-in-law, had there joined the army of Juba and were maintaining the war against him. He conquered them in the decisive battle of Thapsus (46 B. C.), and as a consequence of this victory Utica was surrendered to him, and several of the leaders of the army—Scipio, Juba and Petreius—following the example of Cato, died a voluntary death.

We note the following changes which have been made by Corneille in making use of these historical facts, changes which for the most part Corneille himself has called attention to in his *Examen*.

1. According to the accepted account Cornelia, frustrated by her friends in her efforts to end her life after she had witnessed the murder of her husband, was carried away in the same galley which had brought them to Egypt. Corneille, basing himself upon the statement of Plutarch,³ that the murderers of her husband undertook to follow and capture her,⁴ imagines that she has actually been captured and brought back to the palace of Ptolemy, where Cæsar meets her. Inasmuch as the reason advanced by Corneille for this change is not to be found in any of his sources, he must have written from memory and have forgotten the actual facts of the case. It would seem as though the change had been suggested to him by Lucan. The ninth book of the *Pharsalia* describes the scenes on the galley on the morning after the murder. The ship is still so near the shore that Cornelia can distinguish the flame of the funeral pyre which consumes the body of her husband under the watchful care of Cordus, and she breaks out into lamentations that she cannot share his fate. With the words,

Linquere, si qua fides, Pelusia littora nolo.

Tu pete bellorum casus et signa per orbem

Sexte, paterna move (ix. 82-84),

she tries to persuade her son Sextus to leave

³ *Vie de Pompeius*, cx.

⁴ Corneille turns this into an actual command of Ptolemy: 'qu'elle fut poursuivie sur mer par les ordres de Ptolomée.'

her behind. But in spite of her petition she is carried away from the sad scene. Corneille evidently thought that it was not unreasonable to suppose that her wish had been granted, and that she had remained behind in Egypt. This change makes Act iii, Scene 4; Act iv, Scene 4; Act v, Scenes 1, 2, 3 and 4 possible, in which Cornélie takes a prominent part in the events after Cæsar's arrival, for which Corneille found no authority in his sources.

2. The murder of Pompey took place off Pelusium, and Cæsar landed at Alexandria. Corneille lays the scene of the tragedy 'en Alexandrie, dans le palais de Ptolomée.'⁵ Neither the name of Alexandria, nor that of Pelusium, appears in the play itself, as Corneille explains, 'de peur que le nom de l'une n'arrêtât l'imagination de l'auditeur et ne lui fit remarquer malgré lui la fausseté de ce qui s'est passé ailleurs.'

3. Cæsar's war in Alexandria lasted for nearly a year. This Corneille changed to a mere tumultuous uprising at his arrival, as he explains, to bring the action within the limits of twenty-four hours.

4. When Pompey arrived before Pelusium, Ptolemy was at war with Cleopatra, and could scarcely have occupied the same palace with her as the play supposes. This change Corneille introduced to preserve the unity of place.

5. The severed head of Pompey is presented to Cæsar in Corneille's play by the King himself. In speaking of this change, which is in itself of small moment, Corneille says that in both Plutarch and Lucan this was done by an officer of the King whom he calls Théodote. Corneille is mistaken here, as only Plutarch associates the name of Theodotus with this incident,⁶ Lucan mentioning no name whatever and referring to the man who does present the head to Cæsar merely as 'satelles' (ix, 1010). Since in line 597 of the same book Septimius is described as 'satelles,' and since according to line 663 it is he who severs the head of Pompey from his body, it is probable that Lucan thought of Septimius as having performed this shameful act.

6. Corneille has changed completely the relation of Cæsar and Cleopatra. According to him Cæsar is in love with Cleopatra before ar-

riving in Alexandria, in fact sends her letters from the battlefield of Pharsalus telling of his approaching visit, and so his object in coming to Alexandria seems to be less the pursuit of Pompey, than to visit her. He imagines, furthermore, an earlier meeting between the two at the time when her father Ptolomæus Auletes had come to Rome to implore the aid of the Senate.⁷ There is, of course, no foundation for this invention, though the age of Cleopatra⁸ and the time of her father's visit to Rome⁹ do not necessarily militate against it. Corneille does not mention this among the list of historical inaccuracies which he introduced, and his reference to Plutarch, when speaking in the *Examen* of the love of Cæsar for Cleopatra, seems to intimate that he found the story there. This is, however, not the case. Plutarch describes the first meeting of the two in his *Life of Cæsar*.¹⁰ He relates that it took place soon after the arrival of Cæsar in Alexandria, when Cleopatra implored his help against her brother. Through the machinations of Photinus she had been driven from the court of Ptolemy, and was in the country near by. Cæsar sent for her, and having no other means of entering into the city, she had herself carried into Cæsar's presence in a bundle of clothing by a faithful servant called Apollodorus. Plutarch continues:¹¹

"Ce fut la première emorche, à ce que l'on dit, qui attira Cæsar à l'aimer, pource que ceste ruse luy feit appercevoir qu'elle estoit femme de gentil esprit: mais depuis quand il eut cogné sa douceur et bonne grace, il en fut encore bien plus espris. . . ."

This falsification of history is quite important for the play. It fills up a large portion of Act i, Scene 3, and Act ii, Scene 1; but its influence does not end there. Evidences of it are apparent, wherever Cæsar and Cleopatra face each other in a dialogue.

The question is of interest in this connection, whether there exists any fact in the story of Cleopatra that could possibly have led Corneille to introduce the alteration. This question may be answered affirmatively. Appian, *De Bellis Civilibus*, v. 8, in speaking of Antony's love for Cleopatra mentions a first meet-

⁷ Cp. Act i, line 289.

⁸ She was born between 72 and 68 B. C., probably about 69-68 B. C.

⁹ Between the years 63 and 55 B. C.

¹⁰ Chap. lxiii.

¹¹ Chap. lxiv.

⁵ The early editions from 1644 to 1694 added the word 'royal' before 'palais.'

⁶ *Vie de Julius Cæsar*, lxii.

ing between the two at the time when Gabinus, acting under orders from Pompey, was reinstating Ptolomæus Auletes on his throne, and Antony was an officer in his army¹²:

"Tum vero Antonius, præter formæ speciem, ingenii etiam lumen Cleopatæ admiratus, juvenili statim amore mulieris exarsit. Sed quum ingenio semper ad hæc flexili perhibetur fuisse; tum in hanc jam olim, puellam etiam tum Petulantius Conjecisse oculos fertur, quum Gabinium ducem juvenis secutus esset Alexandriam præfectus equitum."

7. Corneille advances the age of Ptolemy. His real age was about ten years.¹³ Appian, *op. cit.*, ii. 84, says he was at that time in his thirteenth year. This age makes his visit to Rome in company with his father and Cleopatra¹⁴ practically impossible. Corneille gives as his authority for the change Hirtius, *De Bello Alexandrino*, who speaks of him in chap. xxiv as "puer jam adulta ætate," and Lucan's apostrophe to him,¹⁵ "degener, incestæ sceptris jam cessure sorori." The evident reference in this line, says Corneille, is to her incestuous marriage with her brothers. Whether it refers to her older brother, or to the marriage with the younger, which was arranged by Cæsar before his departure, in either case the older brother, the Ptolemy of the play, must have been of age to marry Cleopatra.

8. Finally Corneille imagines that Pompey brings with him to Alexandria a copy of the testament of Ptolomæus Auletes. There is no authority for this change, but it was probably suggested by the following passage from Cæsar, *De Bello Civili*, iii. 108:

"In testamento Ptolomæi patris heredes erant scripti ex duobus filiis major, et ex duabus ea, quæ ætate antecederat. Hæc uti fierent, per omnes deos, perque fœdera, quæ Romæ fecisset, eodem testamento Ptolomæus populum Romanum obtestabatur. Tabulæ testamenti unæ per legatos ejus Romam erant adlatæ, ut in ærario ponerentur (hæ quum propter publicas occupationes poni non potuissent, apud Pompejum sunt depositæ), alteræ, eodem exemplo, relictæ atque obsignatæ Alexandriæ proferebantur."

After having thus pointed out the general changes introduced by Corneille into the story furnished him by his sources, we may proceed to a more detailed study of the play itself.

¹² I cite from the Latin translation of the work published by Firmin Didot, Paris, 1850.

¹³ Cp. Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 447.

¹⁴ Mentioned by Corneille, Act i, line 293.

¹⁵ viii. 693.

Les Acteurs. The characters which Corneille obtained directly from his immediate sources are Jules Cæsar, Cornélie, Ptolomée, Cléopâtre, Photin, Achillas, Septime, Achorée and Philippe. The names call for no particular comment, with the exception of that of Photin, who is called Pothinus in both Lucan and Plutarch. Marty-Laveaux appends a footnote stating that certain manuscripts of Cæsar's work read Photinus. The office of Achorée is changed: in Lucan, viii. 475 ff, he is mentioned as a priest and friend of Pompey; Corneille makes of him a squire of Cleopatra, but does not change his friendship for Pompey.

Corneille added the names of Marc-Antoine, Lépide and Charmion. Marc Antony was present at the battle of Pharsalus, where he commanded the left wing of Cæsar's army,¹⁶ but after Pompey's defeat, Plutarch relates that Cæsar made him *maître de la chevalerie* and as such sent him back to Rome.¹⁷ Lepidus was made prefect of Spain by Cæsar before he set out for the battle of Pharsalus, and was not in Cæsar's company when he reached Alexandria. Neither character influences the action of the play in the slightest degree, and the question presents itself naturally why Corneille should have introduced them. The answer must be based on surmises, but we may believe that he was influenced by the union of these names in the later so-called Second Triumvirate of Octavius, Antonius and Lepidus. Both always appear as the companions of Cæsar when he comes on the scene. Lepidus is a mute character throughout the play, while Antony takes part in the dialogue in one instance in Act iii, Scene 3, where he has to play the incongruous part of Cæsar's confidant. He is sent by him to Cleopatra with messages of love, and in the scene in question he sings the praises of her beauty and assures Cæsar that his love is returned.

Charmion, mentioned as one of the favorite women of Cleopatra by Plutarch in his life of Antony, suggested itself naturally as the *confidante* of Cleopatra here.

ACT I, SCENE I. The play opens with a council scene between Ptolemy and his three advisers Photin, Achillas and Septime concern-

¹⁶ Cp. *De Bello Civili*, iii. 89.

¹⁷ *Vie d'Antoine*, chap. xii.

ing the reception to be accorded to Pompey after his defeat at Pharsalus. All the sources agree in stating that Ptolemy was persuaded to consent to the murder by the advice of his counselors. Corneille follows Lucan, viii. 472 ff., and Plutarch, *Vie de Pompeius*, cviii, and following. Lucan mentions as present at the council Acoreus (line 475) and Pothinus (line 483), while Achilles soon after (line 539) points out the boat, which is bringing Pompey to the shore. Plutarch names Pothinus, the rhetorician Theodotion,¹⁸ and Achilles as taking part in the deliberation. The attitude of mind, which caused Corneille's choice of characters here is easily seen. He follows Plutarch in the general outline of the scene with its threefold division, but he selects those characters which take the most prominent part in the action, namely, Pothinus the King's privy counselor, and Achilles and Septime, the two murderers.

The opening speech of the play is Corneille's own. It is befitting that the King should open the council meeting. Then follows a speech of Photin (ll. 50-116) advising Pompey's death. This is based completely on the speech of Pothinus in Lucan, viii. 484-535. The agreement of the individual lines, indicated by Corneille, is as follows:

Corneille 59-66=	Lucan, viii. 503-511;
" 70 = "	" 528-529;
" 73-74= "	" 484;
" 75-78= "	" 485-486;
" 80 = "	" 486;
" 81-84= "	" 487;
" 82 = "	" 487;
" 85-88= "	" 503-505;
" 93 = "	" 519;
" 97-100= "	" 520-523;
" 105-106= "	" 489-490;
" 107-108= "	" 494;
" 109 = "	" 495;
" 110-112= "	" 492-493.

Then follows a speech of Achilles (ll. 117-160). In Lucan he is mentioned immediately after the advice of Pothinus is given, which ends the council. He is described as "sceleri delectus Achilles" (Lucan, viii. 538) and sets to work at once to prepare for the murder. Achilles in Corneille's play advises neutrality.

¹⁸ The name occurs as Theodotus in the *Life of Caesar*, lxii.

Let Ptolemy refuse to receive Pompey, but unless absolutely necessary let him not commit the murder. The speech seems based on Lucan, viii. 542-560, which contains the poet's reflections on the impending crime. Some of the lines of Achilles' speech resemble quite closely certain lines of this passage in Lucan. Corneille, ll. 117-132, contains a prayer to be neutral and cautious, the thought of which tallies with Lucan, viii. 550-560. Lines 133-134 refer to Ptolemy's indebtedness to Pompey; a similar thought is found in Lucan, viii. 559-560. Lines 140 ff., in which Achilles endeavors to prove to Ptolemy that Caesar had done more towards reinstating his father than Pompey, are as it were an answer to Lucan, viii. 557-558:

Nescis, puer improbe, nescis¹⁹

Quo tua sit fortuna loco.

The reference to the money advanced by Caesar to the King's father is evidently suggested by a passage in Plutarch, *Vie de César*, lviii: "à cause que le père du roy, qui lors regnoit en Aegypte devoit à César un million et sept cents cinquante mille escus. . . ."¹⁹

The speech of Septime which follows next (ll. 161-188) is interesting for several reasons. We pointed out a few moments ago why Corneille substituted Septimius for the Theodotion of Plutarch; it here becomes evident that the change is merely one of names. What Septime here advises is based entirely on the advice of Theodotion in Plutarch. He begins with the words:

"Seigneur, je suis Romain; je connois l'un et l'autre,"

which calls to mind Plutarch's characterization of Septimius (*Pomp.*, cix): "Septimius, qui autrefois avoit eu charge de gens sous Pompeius." Theodotion in Plutarch proposes three alternatives: 1. To receive Pompey; 2. To close the port to him; 3. To kill him. Corneille accepts these, and adds the only other possibility, to deliver Pompey into Caesar's power. One line at least even preserves the language of Amyot. Compare line 186,

"Par là vous gagnez l'un et ne craignez plus l'autre,"

with Plutarch: "ilz acquerroient la bonne grace de l'un et ne craindroient plus la male grace de l'autre."

¹⁹ As a matter of fact the money had not been loaned by Caesar directly, but by a money-lender by the name of Rabirius Postumus, who is believed to have acted as Caesar's agent. Cp. Mahaffy, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

I have entered thus minutely into the analysis of this scene in order to point out the error of Marty-Laveaux and Picot in maintaining that Corneille was influenced in the construction of this scene by a tragedy on the same subject published in 1638 by Chaulmer (*La Mort de Pompée*). Chaulmer presents the same council scene in Act iv, Scene 5, which Marty-Laveaux reprints on pp. 111 ff. It is quite probable that Corneille was acquainted with this play, but there is no evidence whatever that he was influenced by it. Marty-Laveaux's error proceeds from the notion that both Chaulmer and Corneille used Lucan as the sole source of their plots. If this be true, then, of course, the credit of having invented the council scene belongs to Chaulmer, and Corneille must have got his setting from him. However this is not so. Everything points to the conclusion that Chaulmer did not use Lucan at all, but Plutarch. The names of his counselors are Photin, Achilles and Théodote as in Plutarch, and their advice is also suggested by the same author. Photin votes for a friendly reception to Pompey and help in his misfortune. Achilles advises not to receive him, and Théodote votes for his death. These opinions agree too closely with Plutarch to admit of doubt: compare *Pompeius*, cviii:

"les uns vouloient que l'on le renvoyast, les autres que l'on l'appelast et que l'on le receust. Mais le rhétoricien Theodotion . . . alla discourir que l'un ny l'autre n'estoit seur . . . à raison de quoy le meilleur estoit le mander pour le faire mourir."

The conclusion must be that Corneille may have known Chaulmer's play, but that he worked entirely independently of it, combining as we have shown the account of Lucan with that of Plutarch, while Chaulmer based his play only on the latter.

ACT I, SCENE 2. In a short dialogue between Ptolemy and Photin reference is made to the fact that Pompey is the bearer of the testament of the late King, and Photin uses his influence to deprive Cleopatra of her share in the government.

We have already shown that the former of these two ideas is Corneille's invention, but the latter is evidently derived from Plutarch (*Cæsar*, lxiii): "Pothinus, l'eunuque, lequel . . . apres avoir . . . chassé de la cour Cleopatra. . ."

ACT I, SCENE 3. Cleopatra joins the two and pleads for justice and equity in the treatment of Pompey. The scene contains the statements that Pompey reinstated Ptolomæus Auletes on his throne, that he is the bearer of his testament, that Cæsar met and fell in love with Cleopatra during her visit to Rome with her father, that he advanced the funds to carry on the war of Ptolomæus Auletes, that he was at the very moment on his way to Egypt, and that Cleopatra had received a letter from him notifying her of his speedy arrival. The accuracy of these statements has already been fully discussed.

ACT I, SCENE 4. In a further dialogue between Ptolemy and Photin the new argument for Pompey's death is advanced that if Cæsar loves Cleopatra he will certainly take her side, and the only means of conciliating him will be the death of Pompey. The whole scene is entirely an invention of Corneille.

ACT II, SCENE 1. In a dialogue between Cleopatra and Charmion we learn of the former's love for Cæsar. There is a new reference to Cæsar's letter to her from the battlefield of Pharsalus, and Cleopatra explains that, though she is certain of his love and support, whatever she may do she wishes to protect Pompey for reasons of justice and equity. Corneille's invention is evident.

ACT II, SCENE 2. Achorée brings the news of Pompey's death. The scene is based on Plutarch and Lucan, and we shall again analyze it rather minutely.

Line 456 mentions the arrival of Pompey with three vessels. Both Lucan and Plutarch mention only one. Corneille then notes the following imitations of Lucan for the speech 449-496:

Corneille, 461-463= Lucan, viii. 572-573;

" 469-470= " " 580-582;

" 479-480= " " 596-597.

For the rest, however, the whole speech is based very closely upon Plutarch (*Pomp.*, chap. cix), in some instances reproducing the very language of Amyot.

Cp. line 465:

Enfin, voyant nos bords et notre flotte en armes.

Plutarch:

On voyoit de loing plusieurs galeres de

celles du roy, que l'on armoit en diligence et toute la coste couverte de gens de guerre.

Cp. lines 479-584:

Septime se pr'sente, et lui tendant la main
Le salue empereur en langage romain;
Et comme député de ce jeune monarque:
"Passez, Seigneur, dit-il, passez dans cette barque;
Les sables et les bancs cachés dessous les eaux
Rendent l'accès mal sûr à de plus grands vaisseaux."

Plutarch:

Septimius se leva le premier en pieds, qui salua Pompeius en langage Romain du nom d'Imperator, . . . et luy dit qu'il passast en sa barque, pource que le long du rivage il y avoit force oases et des bancs de sable, tellement qu'il n'y avoit pas assez d'eau pour sa galere.

Lines 499-508 differ slightly from both sources.

Lucan mentions no names; all the conspirators draw their swords and finally Achilles stabs Pompey in the side. Plutarch relates that the first blow was dealt him by Septimius, and that Salvius and Achilles followed the example. Corneille makes Achilles draw his sword as a signal, and then:

Septime et trois des siens, lâches enfants de Rome,
murder Pompey, while even Achilles looks on in horror.

Lines 514-567 continue the account; Corneille mentions the following loans from Lucan:

Corneille, 514-516=Lucan viii, 614-615;

" 519-520= " " 619;

" 526-528= " " 621;

" 529-531= " " 668-675;

" 534-536= " " 698-699;

" 541-542= " " 661-662.

To these we may add lines 521-522=Lucan viii, 617; and lines 522-528, which are in general based on the dying thoughts of Pompey, equal Lucan viii, 622-632. Plutarch could not serve here, since his description of Pompey's death is very brief. There is, however, one line which reproduces again the language of Amyot, namely, line 14:

D'un des paus de sa robe il couvre son visage,

Plutarch:

Pompeius tira sa robe a deux mains au devant de sa face.

Lines 537-542 describe Cornélie's behavior as she witnesses the treason from the galley. Plutarch is silent on this point, Lucan notes her cries, line 638:

Aethera complet vocibus,

and lines 639-661. Corneille differs, however, from Lucan in the following particular. The

Latin poet relates that she made a threefold attempt to end her life (lines 653-661), and is prevented by her friends. This Corneille omits. The flight of her vessel (Corneille, 543-544) is not mentioned by Lucan, and is taken from Plutarch. The pursuit and capture of the vessel by Septimius is Corneille's invention and has already been discussed. The effect of the treachery on the populace of Alexandria (Corneille, 549-556) is not contained in either source, but the burial of Pompey's body by Philippe (lines 557-564) is again based on Plutarch, *Pomp.* chap. cxi. Lucan mentions Cordus as performing that pious office.

The speech of Cleopatra which ends the scene (lines 575-582) seems inspired by Lucan, 701-708, which contain the poet's reflection on Pompey's death. Marty-Laveaux, *op. cit.*, p. 207, adds another reminiscence of Lucan for line 575, which equals Lucan ix, 194-195.

ACT II, SCENES 3 AND 4. These two scenes are concerned with the arrival of Cæsar, the love of Cleopatra, and the wisest course for Ptolemy to follow under the circumstances. Both scenes are Corneille's invention;

ACT III, SCENE I. In a dialogue between Charmion and Achorée we learn of Cæsar's arrival in Alexandria, and of his attitude toward the murder of Pompey. The long speech of Achorée in which these facts are told (lines 735-799) is, in general, based on Lucan. Corneille mentions the following loans:

Corneille, 763-764=Lucan viii, 682-683;

" 766-768= " " 665;

" 769-770= " ix, 1035-1036;

" 783-786= " " 1038-1039;

" 787 = " " 1064-1065.

To these the following additions may be made. The suggestion that Cæsar's sorrow for Pompey was feigned (line 737) is found in Lucan ix, 1035-1043. Lines 755-760 reproduce in spirit the speech of the 'satelles' on the same occasion, Lucan ix, 1032-1033. The lines which follow should correspond with Lucan ix, 1033-1034, but Corneille goes back to Lucan viii, 682-683 and 665, where the face of Pompey at the time of the murder is described. The change is interesting inasmuch as it shows conscious selection. The rejected lines read:

Jam languida morte . . .

Effigies habitum noti mutaverit oris.

There is greater power in the idea that the face of the victim still shows the traces of his anger at the treason. Lines 771-780 are based on Lucan ix, 1035-1043, and lines 788-798 are suggested by Cæsar's speech in Lucan ix, 1070 ff.

ACT III, SCENE 2. This describes the meeting of Cæsar and Ptolemy. The latter offers Cæsar the throne of Egypt, but he rejects it and blames Ptolemy for his treacherous action. Ptolemy tries to justify himself by saying that he intended to work for the interest of Cæsar. This scene still follows Lucan, and Corneille has noted the following loans:

Corneille, 829 = Lucan ix, 1073-1074;
 " 833-834 = " " 1075-1076;
 " 841-842 = " " 1081-1083;
 " 845-846 = " " 1083-1084.

To these we may add:

Corneille, 914-916 = Lucan ix, 1066-1068;
 " 939-941 = " " 1091-1092.

ACT III, SCENE 3. This scene has already been discussed. It is entirely Corneille's invention. Antony, who had been sent to Cleopatra with the offer of Cæsar's love, joins Cæsar and Lepidus, and renders an account of his visit. At the same time he notifies Cæsar of the capture of Cornelia.

ACT III, SCENE 4. In the dialogue which now follows Corneille returns again to his sources. For the speech of Cornélie (lines 985-1026) in which she bemoans her fate and the death of her husband, and defies Cæsar, he notes the following loans from Lucan:

Corneille, 999-1000 = Lucan ix, 108;
 " 1014 = " viii, 90;
 " 1015-1016 = " " 93-94;
 " 1017-1018 = " " 88-89.

That is to say, he has borrowed one thought from Cornelia's speech in Lucan on the morning after Pompey's murder, while the remaining passages are taken from her exclamations when she receives the news of his defeat at Pharsalus. In addition he has also made use of Cornélie's speech in Garnier's *Cornélie*, Act ii, Scene 1. The similarity of ideas is often most striking, compare Corneille, 1011-1020, with Garnier, 280-286, and 293-302. Curiously enough, these are the very lines which he cites as translations from Lucan, and it might be maintained that the similarity is due to the fact that both

drew from the same source. However, there are some expressions which occur in both Corneille and Garnier, which are not suggested by Lucan.

Compare Corneille, 1012:

Elle n'est que l'effet du malheur qui me suit

Garnier, 283;

C'est un malheur couvert, une sourde influence,
 Que j'ay reçu du ciel avecque ma naissance.

The suggestion of this thought lies in Lucan viii, 90-91:

. Me pronuba ducit Erinys

Crassorumque umbræ

Compare Corneille, 1019-1020:

Et si j'eusse avec moi porté dans ta maison
 D'un astre envenimé l'invincible poison!

Garnier, 297:

Je suis comme un poison

Here Lucan contains nothing similar. Lines 995-996 are based upon the account of Cornelia's action in Lucan viii, 654-661, which Garnier also follows in lines 411-416. Plutarch makes no mention of any attempt on the part of Cornelia to end her life.

Cæsar's answer to Cornelia, lines 1027-1071, is based in part upon Lucan. The following lines are noted by Corneille:

Corneille, 1050-1056 = Lucan ix, 1099-1104;

" 1058 = " " 1097.

These are the words placed by Lucan in the mouth of Cæsar when the head of Pompey is presented to him. Part of this speech Corneille had already used in scene 2 of the same act.

ACT IV, SCENE 1. This scene outlines the inception of the conspiracy led by Photinus and Achillas against Cæsar. The account is given by Lucan x, 331-434. Corneille notes the following loans:

Corneille, 1104-1108 = Lucan x, 386-389;

" 1110 = " iv, 185;

" 1116 = " v, 382;

" 1151-1152 = " x, 396-397;

" 1153-1156 = " x, 11-13.

There is in lines 1146 ff. a reference to a secret underground passage leading from the palace of the Ptolemies out into the open country, for which I have not been able to find any authority.

ACT IV, SCENE 3. This scene is Corneille's invention. Ptolomée leads Cleopatra astray with regard to the plan of the conspirators, and persuades her to intercede with Cæsar for

the pardon of Achilles and Photin. The reference to Cæsar's war in Alexandria as:

Quelque brouillerie, en la ville excitée,

in line 1186 is due to Corneille's forcing the action into the space of twenty-four hours.

ACT IV, SCENE 3. This is also Corneille's invention. Cleopatra asks pardon for Achilles and Photin, and Cæsar seems on the point of granting her prayer, when their new treachery is related to him. Line 1336 contains an allusion to Cæsar's famous: *Veni, vidi, vici*, mentioned by Plutarch (*Cæsar*, lxxv) as having been sent by him to Rome after his victory over Pharnaces, son of Mithridates, on which expedition he went directly from Alexandria.

ACT IV, SCENE 4. Before Cæsar has time to give his final answer Cornélie brings the news of the plot against his life. This is an invention of Corneille. Lucan relates that the attempt miscarried, because Cæsar distrusted the Egyptians. In Plutarch (*Cæsar* lxxiv) the conspiracy is discovered by Cæsar's barber.

ACT IV, SCENE 5. Cleopatra is convinced of the treachery. She sees her mistake with regard to Achilles and Photin, but she still asks for clemency toward her brother, and this Cæsar promises readily. Here also we have free invention.

ACT V, SCENE I. Cornélie appears, bearing in her hand a small funeral urn, and she hears from Philippe the story of Pompey's burial. This scene Corneille imitated from Garnier, *Cornélie*, Act iii, Scene 3. The similarity was first pointed out by Voltaire in his *Commentaire*. However, scarcely more than the setting comes from Garnier, where the story is very much abbreviated. Corneille uses Garnier's source, which is Plutarch (*Pomp.* cxi), and combines with it the account of Lucan viii, 712 ff. This becomes evident from the fact that Corneille represents both Philippe and Cordus as having been present at the burning of Pompey's body. Philippe is not mentioned in Lucan, and the name of Cordus does not appear in Plutarch. Philippe begins his account in line 1485 with the words:

Tout couvert de son sang . . .

which may have been suggested by the fact that Plutarch relates that Septimius stabbed

Pompey, while Philippe was assisting him to rise. Lines 1489-1493 which follow are based on Lucan viii, 723-725. In Plutarch Philippe does not have to drag the body from the water. The gathering of driftwood (1494-1495) is related in Lucan and Plutarch. The latter goes on to say that while Philippe was busy with this labor of love:

il survint un Romain homme d'aage, qui en ses jeunes ans avait esté à la guerre sous Pompeius . . .

To this man Corneille gives the name of Cordus, Lucan's sole actor. Compare line 1499:

Cordus, un vieux Romain qui demeura en ces lieux.

Lines 1501-1502 are given by Corneille as Lucan viii, 711, but the reported speech of Cordus (1503-1513) is Corneille's invention, as is also the fact that Cordus goes to fetch the urn into which the ashes of Pompey are placed. Plutarch finishes his account by saying:

Les cendres du corps de Pompeius furent depuis rapportées à sa femme Cornelia, laquelle les posa en une siene terre qu'il avoit près la ville de Alba,

and Lucan also mentions the intention of Cordus (770) to carry the ashes of Pompey to Cornelia. But inasmuch as Philippe is the bearer of the ashes, a fact not found either in Plutarch or Lucan, the source for this element of the scene must be sought in Garnier.

The account of the turmoil in Alexandria and the death of Photin (1518-1536) is Corneille's invention as far as the particulars are concerned. Plutarch also relates that the death of Photin occurred before that of Achilles.

The resemblance of the opening lines (1537-1538) of Cornélie's answer on hearing of Cæsar's respect for the memory of Pompey to lines 913-914 of Garnier's tragedy was first pointed out by Voltaire.

Compare Corneille:

O soupirs ! ô respect ! oh ! qu'il est doux de plaindre
Le sort d'un ennemi quand il n'est plus à craindre !

Garnier:

Phil. Cesar plora sa mort. *Corn.* Il plora mort celuy
Qu'il n'eust voulu souffrir estre vif comme luy.

ACT V, SCENE 2. This scene shows side by side Cleopatra and Cornélie, and points out the different interests which each has in the

outcome of Cæsar's battle. The whole scene is freely invented by Corneille.

ACT V, SCENE 3. While the two women are talking Achorée brings the news of the death in battle of Achilles and Ptolomée. Corneille has here harmonized the accounts of his sources, which are greatly at variance. All separate the death of Pothinus (Scene 1) from that of Ptolemy, but only Dio Cassius xlii, 43, and Hirtius, *De Bello Alexandrino*, xxxi, relate that the latter found death by drowning in the Nile. Plutarch states that "il disparut de maniere que l'on ne sceut onques puis qu'il estoit devenu," and Appian, *De Bellis Civilibus*, v. 9, agrees with him. The death of Achilles is not mentioned at all by Plutarch in the life of Cæsar, while in that of Pompey he says Cæsar "feit mourir Achilles et Pothinus." Hirtius and Dio Cassius relate that he was killed by order of Arsinoë, sister of Cleopatra.

ACT V, SCENE 4 AND 5. These scenes bring the action to a suitable close. Cæsar's promise to Cornelia of a worthy funeral of Pompey agrees with his command, related by Dio Cassius, xlii. 8, to bury the head of Pompey with due ceremony. With this exception both scenes are freely invented.

If we now look back upon the results of this study we can see Corneille, with his Lucan and his Amyot open before him, compose his play. He selects first certain prominent scenes, which he distributes at suitable intervals among the different acts. These are: Act i, Scene 1 (the council scene); Act ii, Scene 2 (the description of Pompey's death); Act iii, Scenes 1 and 2 (the arrival of Cæsar, and his attitude toward the murder); Act iii, Scene 4 (the grief of Cornélie); Act iv, Scene 1 (the conspiracy against Cæsar); Act v, Scene 1 (the description of Pompey's burial); and Act v, Scene 3 (the punishment of the conspirators). Between these scenes he fills in others of his own invention (Act i, Scenes 2, 3 and 4; Act ii, Scenes 1, 3 and 4; Act iii, Scene 3; Act iv, Scenes 2, 4 and 5; and Act v, Scenes 2, 4 and 5). When he has arrived at Act iii, Scene 4, he remembers Garnier's *Cornélie* and draws from it certain elements for his own play. He makes use of it again in Act v, Scene 1.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Prinz Friedrich von Homburg. Ein Schauspiel von HEINRICH VON KLEIST. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN, Ph. D. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1899. 12mo, lxxii, 172 pp.

AN edition of Kleist's best drama, which at the same time is one of Germany's classics, is a welcome and long-desired accession to the list of available German texts, even though the demand for it may not prove to be as general as that for some others. The editor has wisely realized the needs of students likely to read the play and has provided, on the whole, a sensible and attractive edition of this standard work. It was a sensible idea, in the very first place, to furnish a rather detailed biography of Kleist, for as the editor correctly says, 'no reference book to which the average student has access gives a biography that satisfies even the most elementary requirements.' The life of Kleist is clearly and sympathetically presented without any exaggerated estimate of the poet as such biographies are apt to fall into. The editor's sympathies have possibly misled him into one or two unfortunate disparaging side-glances at Goethe and Schiller (for example, p. xlv.

'His [Kleist's] work is instinct with genuine dramatic passion as distinct from the emotional eloquence of Schiller as from the Olympic calm of Goethe';

p. xlv:

'Thus Kleist has created a character far more dramatic than the immaculate Max or the thoughtless Egmont').

It is a mistake to challenge comparisons; it very rarely helps the cause of the championed author and may arouse unreasonable antagonism.

It might have been advisable to characterize a little more adequately Kleist's principal works, in the biography, so as to give a more comprehensive idea of the author than is obtained from the reading and criticism of this one, even though his best, work.

In the chapter on Kleist's Character and his Place in German Literature, the editor rightly emphasizes the heroism and tenacity of Kleist in making out of himself what he did and in accomplishing so much in such a comparatively short life, with all its shortcomings. The

chapter as a whole is, however, not entirely satisfactory; it does not present the subject with the same clearness and succinctness as the chapter on the author's life. The reader does not get a perfectly lucid, definite idea of Kleist's marked individuality of style and literary character. The characterization is not deep in its penetration nor clear-cut in its analysis. The editor does not set forth lucidly Kleist's relation to the Romantic school, the distinctive elements of his literary work which connect him so closely with that school; for example, his love of mediævalism of the phantastic and the supernatural, which are so prominent in *Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Michael Kohlhaas*, and also play such an important part in the drama under discussion.

The remaining chapters of the Introduction, namely, 'Historical Introduction,' 'The Hero of the Play,' 'Kleist's Sources,' 'Critical Analysis of the Characters,' 'Dramatic Structure,' 'Meter and Language' and 'Critical Extracts concerning the Play' are carefully done, concise and clear. An occasional statement strikes one as not particularly perspicuous, or open to possible criticism. These are few, however, and affect no essential points.

In his Notes the editor sets out 'to reduce grammatical elucidation to a minimum,' and has succeeded in his purpose. The notes of explanation are succinct, generally to the point, and rarely superfluous. If any criticism is to be made, it is that the editor has the commendable fault of being too chary with his explanations, for there are a few passages which a little more explanation might clear up beyond all doubt. For example, l. 713 is by no means a clear line; the phrase *in dem Lager* (l. 1120) is hardly elucidated by its brief note; l. 1669 is obscure enough to require a line or two of explanation.

There are some few comments which need revision. *Rüstsaal* (l. 49), 'the Zeughaus at Berlin opposite the imperial palace' began to be built in 1695 and was not finished till 1703. Hence Hohenzollern could not have this particular building in mind. It may be an Anachronism of the author, or may be used in a general sense, as heroes' portraits are apt to hang in such places.—Is Hohenzollern (l. 66) *feigning* surprise? Is he not rather expressing his indignation at Homburg's audacity in aspiring so high in his love, as is the case in line 210 and line

928?—The sentiment (l. 474) of an appeal to the heart is not peculiarly 'romantic.' The very quotation following (which, by the way, while relevant, hardly seems necessary), shows that it was as characteristic of the sentimental period of the eighteenth century. Such an appeal might be made at any period of literature.—*Marken* (l. 584) clearly refers to Brandenburg and its subdivisions. It is forcing a point to find anything else in the word.—The comparison with Brutus (776), from the speaker's standpoint, is *most* apt. Homburg has not the particular *offence* in mind, but only the *severity of the sentence* upon a son, and his own unwillingness to submit without protest, as Brutus' son did. The comparison brings out just what Kleist means under the circumstances, no matter how much better the story of the Dictator Papirius may fit the drama as a whole.—That Kleist should have the Catholics in mind in mentioning the *Te Deum* (806) in connection with a Protestant service seems very unlikely. The quotation from *Hermann und Dorothea* hardly adds anything in the way of literary appreciation.—The note to line 949 is a trifle infelicitous. To suggest, as the note does (or else it has no *raison d'être*), that Kleist is led to make Homburg, who in the drama is unmarried, call the Electress aunt because the second wife of the historical Prince of Homburg was the Elector's niece, is going absurdly far in searching for historical sources. If we *must* find an explanation, we can put together lines 1228, where Natalie calls Homburg her cousin, and 242 where she calls the Elector uncle, and a better and more reasonable relationship is established.—*Heiden* (1025) is not necessarily *singular*; it may be *plural*, which would make the omission of the article seem less forced.—In line 1034 it would seem on the whole better to explain the figure as referring to a *Kesselfagd*. It fits the details better and is more like Kleist.—Would it not be possible to understand line 1413 in the sense that the Elector lays the silken cord on the table to use it upon himself in case the attack upon the palace should be successful and he should be in danger of falling into the hands of the rebels? Otherwise, it seems as though he ought to say something about sending it to the rebellious subject.

In the note to 1472 there is evidently

a misprint in the reference to l. 1058, which ought to read 1068. This is the only misprint that a fairly careful reading of the book has discovered, which speaks well for the care and excellence of the proof-reading.

The chief stress in the Notes, however, has been laid upon the literary commentary. The Notes are 'largely literary and critical.' Frequent parallel passages are quoted which 'will indicate better . . . the character and range of the literary influences traceable in this drama.' The editor does not pretend 'that every passage quoted influenced Kleist's thought or his expression directly . . . , but the editor has tried to be conservative in the use of comparative matter and to exclude all that is not fairly relevant.'

In these laudable intentions the editor, however, has not been as successful as in the other parts of his work. Parallel passages and literary echoes are dangerous tools; they frequently do as much harm as they do good; are frequently as misleading as elucidating. With a little practice and study, parallel passages of a certain kind may be multiplied indefinitely. The real task is to make such a selection as will illuminate rather than obscure or pervert the meaning of the passages in connection with which they are cited. Such citations are legitimate and helpful in the following cases. 1. When they define concisely or illustrate any peculiar use of a word. 2. When they make clear or illustrate a passage or a situation, or else show an analogy or contrast to passages in another author. 3. When they show similarity or contrast of thought or expression with other passages in the same author's works. 4. When they indicate any echo or influence from another author.

1. Of the first class, the quotation to *Laub der Weide* (l. 46) is appropriate in every way, and beautiful besides. So is the brief quotation to *Lorbeer* (l. 47), though every student undoubtedly knows what the laurel stands for. The same is true of the quotations to line 852 and 1068, and others. But are the quotations to *zerstampft* (l. 20) at all relevant? Both passages cited show that the phrase *den Acker* (*Feld, Saat*) *zerstampfen* is a poetical way of expressing the ravages of war. But here the phrase is used simply to indicate long waiting and the impatience of the horses. The quota-

tions are actually misleading.—The two quotations to line 783 really give no information, nor are they particularly apt. It seems a pity to quote simply for the sake of quoting. It is degrading poetry to put it to such use. The quotations to *Würgen* (l. 559), *schlechtesten* (l. 975) and *die Brust durchbohren* (l. 984) are appropriate for a lexicon, but not for a literary commentary. So, too, in the note on line 1532 there is a good dictionary exemplification of the use of a word, but the quoted line does not contribute the first iota to an æsthetic appreciation of the word or of the passage. Such quotations are *not* literary comment.

2. Now as to examples of the second class. Of the two quotations to line 387 the second is thoroughly to the point and expresses an exact similarity of thought. But the first is not of that character, and therefore unnecessary. The same may be said of the comparisons suggested in the note on line 270; the second is quite similar to the situation indicated in this line. But Max Piccolomini's distraction at the officers' banquet offers not a single point of resemblance, except the mere fact of distraction. The situation is different, the causes are different, every detail is different. The comparison is misleading. But how different is the quotation to line 407! It makes all further comment unnecessary.

In line 379 the incident of the shying horse, (shying not at a mere tower or at the entrance to any place, but at a windmill which at night might startle any living being), is introduced to motivate the impetuosity of the Elector in threatening the severe punishment (Act ii, Sc. 9). For he has heard that Homburg was detained by the accident. Not that he would change the sentence when once uttered, but he would have hesitated in pronouncing it in the first place, if he had known that Homburg was in the battle. In Shakespeare the shying of the horse is a warning to its rider, an omen of impending disaster as Goethe uses it in *Egmont* and *Goetz*. To cite the passage from Shakespeare here is to throw a false light upon Kleist's meaning.

The reference to a line of *Wilhelm Tell* in connection with line 409 does not seem very relevant. Besides, as it stands, the sense is ambiguous. "This refers to the Catholic matins,

though the Prince was actually a Protestant. So *das Mettenglöcklein in der Waldkapelle. Tell*, 1. 966." What does "So" refer to? Everything after the second sentence is practically worthless.

The *motif* of a broken-down carriage, which compels travelers to discontinue their journey, is a very common one, which both Lessing and Kleist use for their own purposes. The purposes and situations in the two plays however, are entirely different. The note (line 501) contains a bit of information, but one of no pertinence.

The reference to the line from Hamlet in connection with line 1044 is not warranted by either the situation or the bearing of the passages concerned. Hamlet warns Ophelia to go to a nunnery in order to be safe from the world of sin and temptation; Homburg advises Natalie to go, because the world has nothing further to offer her.

In line 1088 the point of *Blume* is not that Homburg is a paragon among men, but only that he will be like a flower to look at and enjoy, though not to pluck. The point is in the unselfishness of Natalie's love and not in the beauty of Homburg, as the note would lead one to think.

In line 1350 Homburg asks for time to consider the proposal carefully, not because he is distracted and cannot attend to business at the present moment, as is the case with Max Piccolomini in the banquet scene. The situations and motives of the two characters are not in the least similar.

3. The second part of the note to line 270, and the notes to lines 1025 and 1566, are very apt illustrations of quotations of similar or contrasting passages from the same author. In line 637, however, while the reference to line 1721 is very appropriate, there seems to be no connection at all between *Gold* as used here and as used in the other passages cited.

The parallelism given to 1373 is possible, but it does seem *raffiniert*, to use a German word for a very common failing of German analogy-hunters.

Parts of the note to 1034 do not seem quite convincing. There is no similarity between Kleist's view of a rural life and Homburg's view here. If the editor had said 'contrast' for

'compare', the note would have been to the point. Nor, while this place is under discussion, can I agree with the editor's statement that Kleist 'doubtless remembered the passage in Piccolomini, etc.' The whole point of the two passages are different, and there is but little similarity of detail.

4. The editor does not claim literary influences for every passage he cites; hence under this fourth head there may be criticisms which ought perhaps to be classed under the second. But the gist of the criticisms, if at all valid, ought to hold here likewise. As examples of probable influence the editor's quotations to lines 986 and 990 are capital, and he has cited many others which are instructive and helpful to the student. But he has also cited parallelisms which are far-fetched and forced. Why cannot Kleist call Homburg's servant *Franz* without being indebted to Goethe for this common name? If the similarity of names is a mere coincidence, the note (1. 109) contains information of no value.

In l. 460 Hohenzollern's excited outcries are so different from Shakespeare's 'Blow, winds, crack your cheeks' that only such a commentator can find a parallelism who is bent upon finding one, whether it be there or not.

Why should the simple statement made in line 590 be ascribed to the influence of Homer? Except for the arrangement of lines, which differs totally from the Greek, one could hardly make the statement more simply. The same is true of line 1289.

While there should be no disputing about tastes, still the statement (note to 596) claiming that Kleist's figure of the vine and the tree is more poetical than Shakespeare's in the *Comedy of Errors* does seem a trifle dogmatic. Under the circumstances, in the moment of such intense excitement and strain, such carefully elaborated poetical imagery seems forced, labored, and justifies to some extent the criticism made of Kleist, '*dass er seine Bilder zu Tode hetzt*.'

The notes to lines 856 and 1610 hardly establish their point. The parallelisms are not at all borne out in detail. There is a similarity of words, but not of substance.

Homburg's monologue (1285 ff.) presents no analogies in thought, purpose, or attendant

circumstances, to Hamlet's famous 'To be or not to be,' except that they both concern death. As the editor himself says, the tone of Homberg's monologue is one of weary resignation, and the thought is, that life here is short and uncertain, while the future life cannot be so bad after all. Hamlet's soliloquy is one of doubt and horror at the uncertainty of the state after death which makes man willing to 'grunt and sweat under a weary life.' He shrinks with horror from death, while Homberg is resigned to the thought of it, and can even jest grimly about it (lines 1294 & 95). In the details there are no analogies either, and nothing supports the author's positive statement that 'this monologue was doubtless suggested by Hamlet's.'

Other quotations cited in the Notes are open to the same criticism. When analyzed, they are either misleading or else irrelevant. Enough has been said, however, to indicate that the editor really made a serious mistake when he suffered himself to be led by the example of certain German commentators (an example which has unfortunately been followed by others in this country), into finding echoes and influences where a common-sense, careful examination shows that there is a surface similarity and nothing else below it. It is the more to be deplored as the book is generally so well and sensibly edited.

An exhaustive bibliography with brief comments on the value of the books and articles cited concludes the volume.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Yale University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*, with Introduction and Notes by JAMES TAFT HATFIELD. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899. 12mo. liv+187 pp.

EIGHT or nine years ago, when the Hewett edition of Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* appeared, it certainly seemed that the last word had been spoken for this text for some time to come. The work contained an introduction that was minute and careful; the text had been thoroughly revised; and, finally, the notes left little to be desired in point of fulness of grammatical detail and literary suggestion.

Prof. Hewett recognized clearly that the "use of any literary work will vary with the purpose of the instructor and the demands of his classes." He accordingly gave a great abundance of critical material, and suggested that each instructor seek out that which was most useful to him. Thus the burden of selecting the proper material was placed where it naturally belongs—upon the user; as a result, the text has proved universally useful.

In this regard, the new edition of *Hermann und Dorothea* by Prof. Hatfield is quite a different type of book. In its own way, it is as complete and perfect as the Hewett edition; but it differs from it in that it is prepared with a definite pedagogic purpose: namely, to cultivate the literary taste of the student rather than to widen his grammatical and philological knowledge. This we are told in the preface to the book; hence we are fully prepared to find a dearth of grammatical facts, supplemented by a free use of every legitimate means of exciting the student's literary appreciation.

Prof. Hatfield has been perfectly consistent in every detail of his work. In the introduction of fifty-four pages, he has furnished all the material necessary for the student as a basis for the study of the poem, as well as its relation to the poet's life. The general impression is pleasing; it is smooth and attractive, conveying the impression that the editor proposes to present the matter in an agreeable, rather than a convincing manner. Nevertheless the facts presented are abundant and accurate. Only in one particular does the material seem incomplete, and that is, in the description of great historical events which served as a background for the poem. But this possible defect is more than offset by the excellence of the sections on the *Sources of the Poem* and its *Metrical Form*. At the time when *Hermann und Dorothea* was written, Goethe was at the very climax of his enthusiasm for the literature of Greece and Rome. Consequently, whoever would interpret any work of this period, must of necessity be thoroughly conversant with the language and literature of the classics. This certainly can be said of Prof. Hatfield; and herein lies the great charm and value of his edition of *Hermann und Dorothea*.

As for the text, little need be said. The

editor has had at his disposal Prof. Hewett's exhaustive critical work,—a fact that places beyond the possibility of dispute the statement that

"the present (text) is more free from outside intrusions than any which has appeared since Goethe undertook the revision of the poem."

But it is in the Notes that our interest naturally centres; for here it is that the editor has taken issue with some of the older schools of editors, and has founded his work on the principle of developing the literary appreciation rather than fostering the love for grammatical soundness. *Hermann und Dorothea* is to be studied as a masterpiece of literature rather than a source of philological inspiration. The editor tells us in his Preface that

"the days are past when the master-work of a great poet could be used chiefly as a *corpus vile* for the demonstration of facts in Indo-European phonetics, and yet the feeling cannot be avoided that we are often not satisfied with the direct message of the artist's creation itself, but must attach a load of outside information If our poem is worthy of the place it has held for a century, it is because it is not a dead work but a living one, and the most helpful interpretation of any such work must always be sought in the living word of one who has reverently penetrated into its spirit, and who transmits it faithfully to the next generation. Some aid must be given to help the transition from the known to the unknown, in the case of the student of a foreign language and civilization, so that the author shall not speak as an alien, but as a friend; some illustrations and parallels which shall aid in the comprehension of the rich content of the words and phrases of a strange idiom; some assistance must be lent in making clear the purpose of the artist, but *whatever is more than these, in the way of insinuated matter, cometh of evil.*"

This will suffice. It is easy to see that Prof. Hatfield is wholly in sympathy with the school of literary editors; he proposes to do for *Hermann und Dorothea* what Prof. Paul Shorey has done for the Odes and Epodes of Horace. A careful examination of the Notes proves that Prof. Hatfield has worked consistently and faithfully. By means of carefully prepared synopses and summaries, and through the agency of a great abundance of "parallel passages" and "cross references," he has sought to draw the student away from the narrow consideration of the grammatical facts, to the enjoyment of the wisest and best in the world's

literature. Now all this is most commendable; but the question still confronts us: To what degree can we hope to get the student to make use of the richness of literary reference? If we can succeed in so doing, the matter is valuable; if not, it must be looked upon as superfluous, fully as much so as a surplusage of grammatical discussion would be. Prof. Shorey has anticipated this possible criticism in the preface of the *Odes and Epodes*, where he states that "they (the parallel passages and cross-references) will not harm him (the young student) more than the critical and grammatical discussions found in all the school editions which *he always skips.*"

In other words, the "parallel passages" and the "cross-references" are recognized as factors of doubtful pedagogic value, neither more nor less harmful than the excess of grammatical details. It is probably true that many good instructors look upon them as impracticable for other than graduate work.

But to return to Prof. Hatfield's own notes, we find that the amount of such doubtful matter is by no means excessive. Most of the quotations are printed in full, which is certainly advisable, since they are thus rendered far more accessible to the younger student. The quotations from the classics are particularly apt and useful, in that they naturally draw the attention to the Greek and Latin originals which Goethe was intentionally imitating. From the side of the German literature, the references are commonly from Schiller or from Goethe's own works; in English we are offered a wide range extending from Shakespeare to F. Marion Crawford. The grammatical references are ample and well chosen, while the brief summaries at the close of several cantos furnish a most useful review of the work that has preceded.

In conformity with the other texts in this series, this edition of *Hermann und Dorothea* is supplied with a brief but sufficiently comprehensive Bibliography and an Index.

Speaking in general, it may be said that the edition is admirably adapted to class-room use. The typographical work is neat and uncommonly free from error. A few rhetorical peculiarities have crept into the Introduction, which after all are more matters of taste than errors. For example, the frequent use of the

inverted predicate becomes unpleasantly noticeable; thus, on page xiii: "Dramatic, no less, is the relation" and "Personal to Goethe is its breadth" etc., etc.

GEORGE T. FILES.

Bowdoin College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Concerning Prof. Lewis's review of my recent book *Scènes de la révolution française* I desire to say that corrections and suggestions are always welcome. I am alone responsible for the way in which the proofs were read and what was overlooked in the first edition will be corrected when an opportunity occurs. I appreciate the care with which the book was read.

Noting the criticisms in detail, I may say that it was impossible to indicate the omissions in the text because they were too numerous. To have done so would have disfigured the book.

The first chapter is the introductory chapter and Lamartine is in no way responsible for anything it contains. The condensation spoken of was, however, made by a Frenchman and if the work was not well done my mistake was in putting my confidence in an unworthy person. *le lendemain* 13 (4: 12) may not be elegant but I am assured that it is correct. Madame de Sévigny, speaking of the death of Turenne, says: *Il devait communier le lendemain dimanche*, which seems to be an analagous construction. *et porta toutes ses armes en triomphe* should read *et emporta toutes ces armes en triomphe*. The mistake is due to an error in transcription. The expression criticised in 5: 11 is certainly not good. It ought to read, *Les citoyens s'y rendaient*, or something of the kind. *armés* is correct in sense but wrong grammatically. Mignet says (5: 14) *moment de guerre*, which does not seem to me to be much better than *jour de guerre*. *temps de guerre* would, I imagine, have been better than either. The sentence 8: 24 (*toute cette nuit*, etc.) is taken literally from Mignet. *l'importe sur* should be *l'emporte sur* (120: 6) and also in the corresponding note.

I do not know whether my interpretation of

26: 12, 14 is better than Prof. Lewis', or not. Both are, doubtless, in accordance with the facts. The hostile demonstrations became more manifest as the king approached Paris, and the crowd also pressed more closely around him in order to show its hostility. I should be glad to see this passage further discussed.

In reply to the criticism that the notes translate too many simple words and phrases, I may say that for some pupils this is true, for others not. While it may be possible to get from most dictionaries the sense of such expressions as *faire part de*, *c'en est fait de moi*, *à l'étranger*, and others, it is, nevertheless, a matter of experience that even good students, especially those who had not read much, sometimes fail to get the meaning of them. Since my object was to make a book suitable for elementary classes, my sins of commission have, perhaps, not been very numerous in this respect.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Prof. Super, in the above letter, explains the infelicities of style which were noted in the first chapter of his *Scènes de la révolution française*. Those who are acquainted with his work feel convinced that these inaccuracies would not have occurred, had he been less modest and prepared, himself, this part of his text.

The expression *toute cette nuit* is not positively wrong, and, of course, would not have been mentioned had not other mistakes existed. *toute la nuit* is somewhat better, from the fact that the expression *cette nuit* tends—it may only tend, but it does tend—to have a specialized meaning.

Prof. Super writes, and is correct in so doing, that it is

"a matter of experience that even good students, especially those who have not read much, sometimes fail to get the meaning of" common expressions. It is, however, doubtful whether this be a satisfactory reason for introducing the explanation of such phrases into the notes. The question is whether such annotation renders the pupil any more successful in understanding whatever idiomatic expressions

he may meet in his future readings. Such help has a tendency to dull his perception for foreign idioms, and it is perhaps well to *force* him to interpret such phrases correctly from the very start, and with the help only of a vocabulary. At any rate, this seems to be the opinion of recent editors, judging by the care with which the annotation of such easy phrases is avoided in texts that are now being published.

Following are some of the phrases to which the above remarks might apply. They are introduced here so that no doubt may exist as to the class of expressions in question. *faire part de*, "to communicate." *émotion*, "excitement, disturbance." *une fois le pont franchi*, "(when) once the bridge (was) crossed." *s'engouffrent*, "rush, disappear." *impose à*, "overawes." *qu'il s'en coiffe*, "let him put it on." *contre-coups*, "effects, consequences." *émotions*, "excitement, disturbance" (a second explanation of the same word). *enfouissement*, "recess." *épanchements de famille*, "family confidences." *tout haut*, "out loud," *retraçait*, "reproduced." *puisait dans*, "derived from." *à mesure*, "as he read them." *déguisement*, "denial, subterfuge." *porter*, "bear, rest." *tribune*, "stage, platform." *journaliers*, "ordinary; such as they were daily." *renversée*, "thrown back." *incriminées*, "regarded as criminal," etc. It should be added that this text contains fewer such notes than do a great many editions, especially among those that were published several years ago.

The kindly manner in which Prof. Super meets criticism, or rather, suggestions, is fully appreciated by the reviewer.

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

Princeton University.

MACHIAVELLI.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Miss Mary A. Scott says in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. xiv, No. 4.

"Mr. Edward Meyer, in his dissertation, *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama* (Weimar, 1897), has collected three hundred and ninety-five instances of Machiavelli's name, or supposed maxims, occurring in Elizabethan literature. As the *Prince* was not translated until 1640, Mr. Meyer argues that the source of Elizabethan Machiavellianism was Simon Patrick's

translation of Innocent Gentillet's, *Discours d'Estat sur les moyens de bien gouverner et maintenir en bonne paix un royaume et une principaute, contre Nicol. Machiavel*. (1576.) The difficulty of this argument is, that, although the dedication of Patrick's translation is dated 1577, the book was not entered on the *Stationers' Register*, nor printed, until 1602. Many of the allusions belong to the sixteenth century. It is possible that Patrick's translation may have been known in manuscript; it is also possible that many persons may have read Gentillet, either in the original Latin, or in French. From the vogue of Italian at the time, and from the constant travelling to and fro between England and Italy, I myself see no difficulty in supposing what must have been the fact, that educated Englishmen at least read Machiavelli in his own simple, unaffected, vivid Italian. Machiavelli is a writer who will never be read, except by the few, but his positive spirit, his practical method, is precisely of the sort that must have appealed most strongly to the Elizabethans."

That this is what the book in question stated and sought to establish can easily be shown by comparing Miss Scott's own words with those of the book.

Miss Scott says:—"the Prince was not translated until 1640." . . . Patrick's translation of Gentillet is dated 1577, . . . nor printed, until 1602.

The book says:—

"the weightiest writings of Machiavelli remained un-Englished till Dacre's version of the *Discorsi* in 1636 and of the *Principe* in 1640" (p. ix).

"The first English translation of which there is a copy extant appeared in 1640" (p. 2).

"In the following year (1577), an English translation was made of Gentillet's book by Simon Patericke, and dedicated to Francis Hastings and Edward Bacon: the first edition appeared in 1602: the second in 1608" (p. 20).

Miss Scott says:—"It is possible that Patrick's translation may have been known in manuscript." That is exactly what the book seeks to prove in many places: thus for example, referring to Harvey's "*Medicæorum Hymnus*," in which Machiavellian maxims are used.—

"Other instances of contiguity might be given, but surely those cited are enough to show, that Harvey must have had Gentillet before him, and that probably in the MS. translation of Patericke" (p. 24).

Miss Scott says:—"educated Englishmen at least read Machiavelli."

The book reads,—

"Ascham himself had been in Italy, . . . He

was the first to mention Machiavelli" (p. 16).

"Soon after Ascham's book, however, Machiavelli began to interest English readers, as he had already done French. The case of young Gabriel Harvey is typical of this movement: at twenty-three years of age in 1573, a student at Cambridge, he had not read the Florentine's works, but was eager to see them, and begged Remington to loan him his copy," (p. 17). . . .

"Incontinently Harvey was perusing and reperusing Machiavelli," (p. 18.) Sidney, too, had become acquainted with "Machiavelli's works: probably at Oxford," (p. 18).

"The rapidity with which Machiavelli came into favor at Cambridge, and the extent to which he was read, is remarkable: in 1579, Harvey claimed his works had supplanted all others, . . . now Greene was a student at Cambridge in this year, and Marlowe in the next: . . . Harvey accuses both the dramatists of having used Machiavellian principles in their profligate lives, and Greene confesses it true" (p. 25).

"In the same year Harvey informed Spencer:—Machiavel a great man' at Cambridge, and Italian studies flourishing" (p. 25).

"Thus the safe conclusion is that Kyd used the Principe in portraying Lorenzo" (p. 33).

"He (Marlowe) had studied Machiavelli with a vengeance: and it may be stated as an absolute certainty, that had the Principe never been written, his three great heroes would not have been drawn with such gigantic strokes" (p. 34).

Many more citations might be given showing how the book sought to prove the play-wrights had almost all read Machiavelli in the original Italian or French translation.

"Elizabethan play-wrights had the 'Prince' always within easy reach, however, in the French translation of 1553, and that of 1586, which appeared just when the great drama was burgeoning" (p. 3).

That the dramatists drew from prevalent popular prejudice rather than from their own studies is patent and reasonable to any one who knows how play-wrights must pander to the public.

"Greene had been long in Italy, and was well read in . . . Machiavelli, but in his use of the latter he seems to have sacrificed his own knowledge to that panderism to public taste and feeling, which was so characteristic of the gifted writer" (p. 27).

Mohl says that Gentillet became the great arsenal for the maxims, and Burd says it was the source of Machiavellianism (pp. 8-9). How the dramatists used Gentillet instead of Machiavelli, one instance will suffice, Chapman's

"Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany," where the English is a direct translation of the French and not the Italian:—

'1. A prince must be of the nature of the lion and the fox, but not the one without the other.' I, 1 (Shepherd 382).

Gentillet says:—

'Le Prince doit ensuyure la nature du Lyon, et du Renard: non l'un sans l'autre,' p. 354.

Patericke translates:—

'A prince ought to follow the nature of the Lyon and of the Fox, yet not of the one without the other.'

Machiavelli says:—

'Essendo adunque un principe necessitato sapere bene usare la bestia, debbe di quella pigliare la volpe ed il leone: perchè il leone non si difende dai lacci, la volpe non si difende da' lupi. Bisogna adunque essere volpe a conoscere i lacci, e leone a sbiggottire i lupi. Coloro che stanno semplicemente in sul leone non se ne intendono' (xviii).

Chapman the scholar certainly knew both Machiavelli and Gentillet. It is plain which he used.

Why does Miss Scott devote a page to stating as her own ideas, those palpably taken from the book in question, and already accepted by reviewers and scholars? Those interested may compare Koppel's review in the *Englische Studien* (1897): *The Nation* Vol. 64, p. 225: Prof. Dr. J. Schick's edition of Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, p. 140, or John Morley's *Machiavelli*, p. 40.

EDWARD MEYER.

Western Reserve University.

MILTON'S L'ALLEGRO 25.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS: It has never, I think, been noticed that Milton's

Haste thee, Nymph, and bring with thee
Jest and youthful Jollity

may owe something to Horace, *Od.* I. 30. 5-8:

Fervidus tecum puer et solutis
Gratiae zonis properentque Nymphae
Et parum comis sine te Juventas
Mercuriusque.

The Latin poet is invoking Venus (cf. *L'Al.* 14), mentions the Nymphs and Graces (cf. *L'Al.* 15, 25), has an equivalent for 'Haste' and 'with thee,' and suggests Milton's 'youthful' by his 'Juventas,' and perhaps Jest and Jollity by 'Mercurius.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.